

# CHURCH HISTORY



Published by  
THE BOARD OF CHURCH HISTORY

# THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

FOUNDED BY PHILIP SCHAFY, 1833; REORGANIZED, 1906; INCORPORATED BY ACT OF  
THE LEGISLATURE OF NEW YORK, 1916

## OFFICERS FOR 1939

CHARLES LYTTLE	President
ROLAND H. BARTON	Vice-President
MATTHEW SPINKA	Secretary
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS	Treasurer
ROBERT FORTENBAUGH	Assistant Secretary

## OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

WILLIAM WARREN SWIFT	HERBERT WALLACE SCHNEIDER
CONRAD HENRY MORGAN	REUBEN E. E. HARKNESS
FREDERICK WILLIAM LOSTNER	F. W. BUCKLEN
JOHN THOMAS McNEEL	E. R. HARDY, JR.
WILLIAM PARKS	PERCY V. NORWOOD

## EDITORIAL BOARD OF CHURCH HISTORY

MATTHEW SPINKA, Managing Editor  
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS  
CHARLES LYTTLE, ex officio

PUBLICATION OFFICE, BIRMINGHAM, ALABAMA

EXECUTIVE AND FINANCIAL OFFICE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

*Church History* is a quarterly journal published in March, June, September, December by the American Society of Church History. The subscription price is three dollars per year. The price of single copies is seventy-five cents. To foreign countries, the postage of twenty-five cents a year should be added. Subscriptions should be sent to Professor Matthew Spinka, 5757 University Ave., Chicago, or to Professor Robert Hastings Nichols, 10 Nelson Street, Auburn, New York. Remittances should be made to the order of American Society of Church History.

All correspondence regarding contributions, book reviews, and all other matters of editorial nature should be sent to Professor Matthew Spinka, 5757 University Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

Changes of mailing addresses and changes of address should be addressed to Prof. R. H. Nichols, 10 Nelson St., Auburn, N. Y.

Entered as second-class matter March 2, 1934, at the post office at Chicago, Ill., under No. 4207, March 2, 1932.

# CHURCH HISTORY

## EDITORIAL BOARD

MATTHEW SPINKA, *Managing Editor*

ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS

CHARLES LYTTLE, *ex officio*

---

Vol. VIII

September, 1939

No. 3

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

FLORENTINE PLATONISM AND ITS RELATIONS WITH HUMANISM AND SCHOLASTICISM <i>Paul Oskar Kristeller</i>	201
ORIGEN AND THE REGULAE FIDEI <i>Albert C. Outler</i>	212
GOSSNER MISSIONARIES IN AMERICA <i>George B. Arbaugh</i>	222
JOHN WESLEY'S GEORGIA MINISTRY <i>Edgar Legare Pennington</i>	231
THE SCOTTISH EFFORT TO PRESBYTERIANIZE THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND <i>Winthrop S. Hudson</i>	255
BOOK REVIEWS:	283
DODD, CHARLES HAROLD: <i>History and the Gospels</i> , Henri R. Percy	
ANGUS, S.: <i>Essential Christianity</i> ..... Robert Hastings Nichols	

## CONTENTS

WILLIAMSON, CLAUDE, ED.: <i>Great Catholics</i>	John M. Lenhart, O. M. Cap.
BERNHART, JOSEPH: <i>The Vatican as a World Power</i> , C. C. Eckhardt	
DUCKETT, ELEANOR SHIPLEY: <i>The Gateway to the Middle Ages</i>	John T. McNeill
MARCUSE, LUDWIG: <i>Soldier of the Church: The Life of Ignatius Loyola</i>	Robert Hastings Nichols
HALLER, WILLIAM: <i>The Rise of Puritanism</i>	Leland H. Carlson
CADBURY, HENRY J.: <i>Annual Catalogue of George Fox's Papers</i>	Paul G. Morrison
MCCONNELL, FRANCIS J.: <i>John Wesley</i>	Arthur W. Nagler
GOODWIN, MARY C.: <i>Papal Conflict with Josephinism</i>	Matthew Spinka
RILEY, ARTHUR J.: <i>Catholicism in New England to 1788</i>	Thomas F. O'Connor
WERTENBAKER, THOMAS JEFFERSON: <i>The Founding of American Civilization: The Middle Colonies</i> , William W. Sweet	
BEARDSLEY, FRANK GRANVILLE: <i>The History of Christianity in America</i>	Charles T. Thrift, Jr.
SMITH, JOSEPH FIELDING, ED.: <i>Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith</i>	Clifford M. Drury
HALPERIN, S. WILLIAM: <i>Italy and the Vatican at War</i>	Herbert W. Schneider
FOSTER, FRANK HUGH: <i>The Modern Movement in American Theology</i>	Edwin E. Aubrey
DAVIS, HELEN C. M., COMP.: <i>Some Aspects of Religious Liberty</i>	Matthew Spinka



944  
L.B. Vander Velle  
3-7-98

## FLORENTINE PLATONISM AND ITS RELATIONS WITH HUMANISM AND SCHOLASTICISM

PAUL OSKAR KRISTELLER

*Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut*

The early humanism in Italy from the second half of the fourteenth to the middle of the fifteenth century, characterized by the discovery and revival of classical antiquity, was at the same time the first expression of modern ideals and feelings. Although it was in several points closely connected with the preceding age, it produced a lively reaction against the medieval civilization and its form of philosophical and scientific thought, scholasticism. Petrarch, the father of humanism, began the polemics against scholasticism which have remained since then a commonplace in the writings of his followers: according to him the scholastics wasted their time in subtle and useless disputations without resolving the basic questions of human life; their unpolished Latin style was a consequence of their barbarous thought; they could not be compared with the great writers and thinkers of classical antiquity whom they were not able to read or imitate; and even their chief authority, Aristotle, in many respects must be considered inferior to his greater master, Plato.<sup>1</sup>

This attack failed to have that effect which one might expect. Scholastic teaching and tradition were continued not only in the European countries where the new humanistic movement arrived much later, but in Italy itself there was a strong scholastic and Aristotelian tradition throughout the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries which had its centre in the University of Padua. This fact means not only that new periods always possess traces of the old ones, and that with the rising of new ideas the old continue to survive for a certain time, but also that the scholastic tradition persisted because early humanism did not provide a substitute in the form of a real philosophy. Humanism was a general movement of great force which had

<sup>1</sup> Voigt-Lehnerdt, *Die Wiederbelebung des klassischen Altertums* (Berlin 1893), II, 451 ff.

indirect philosophical importance because it was preparing new concepts and problems; it contained religious feelings, political views, moral opinions, and above all a general ideal of education, but no metaphysical ideas or speculative systems. The humanists made translations of Plato, Aristotle, and other ancient philosophers, but the discussions of the contemporary Greek scholars brought forth no response among their Italian fellows.<sup>2</sup> The humanists produced mere literature, not philosophy; they wanted to remove the authority of Aristotle, but they put in his place not Plato, but Cicero.

Only in the second half of the fifteenth century there appeared a truly philosophical school in Italian humanism, namely the Florentine Academy, represented by its leader, Marsilio Ficino, and his younger friend, Giovanni Pico della Mirandola. A new speculative thought was rising, not only a program of general education and literary style, and Plato was really taking the place of Aristotle.

• That Ficino and Pico were humanists can not be denied. They lived in the same social and cultural atmosphere as the earlier humanists. Their Latin style reveals the formal education of the humanistic school and the imitation of the classical writers. They cultivated their correspondence and collected for publication, as did their predecessors, letters, in which we can see, aside from the rhetorical form, the immediate expression of personal life and feeling. • Pico composed Latin and Italian poems and commented in Italian on a *canzone* of his friend Benivieni, as Lorenzo de' Medici commented on his own sonnets. Ficino was interested in the old Tuscan poets and translated Dante's *De Monarchia* and some of his own tracts into Italian, in this respect illustrating the particular tendency of Florentine humanism of his time. • His translations of Plato, Plotinus, and other ancient philosophers, and his commentaries on them, may be compared with what the other humanists did for ancient Greek rhetors, poets, and historians. His revival of Platonism may be considered as a realization of Petrarch's vague dream. And many of Ficino's and Pico's philosophical problems were closely connected with modern tendencies of humanistic thought; we may mention the theory of love, the doctrine of the *dignitas hominis*, and above all the whole anthropocentrism of their

<sup>2</sup> In the case of Ugo Benzi this statement will be confirmed by new researches of D. P. Lockwood.

speculation opposed to the medieval theocentrism. So the intellectual movement of humanism found in Ficino and Pico at last its philosophical expression. And certainly Ficino himself felt that his Platonism was in perfect harmony with the renaissance of classical antiquity in other regions of art and science. "This century," so he writes to Paulus Middelbergensis, "like a golden one has brought to light the liberal arts formerly nearly extinguished: that is grammar, poetry, rhetoric, painting, sculpture, architecture, music . . . At Florence it has also brought the Platonic doctrine into light from darkness."<sup>3</sup>

But if after that we expect from the Platonists a continuation of the preceding humanistic polemic against scholasticism, we shall be much disappointed; we find that the opposite has happened. As for Pico, the fact is much simpler and generally admitted by his interpreters.<sup>4</sup> He studied at Padua and at Paris, the most important centres of scholastic tradition. The disputation he proposed to hold in Rome was conceived after the model of the frequent scholastic disputations in Paris.<sup>5</sup> The *Conclusiones* and the *Apologia* have an obviously scholastic character in quotations, problems, and method. But his whole position was clearly expressed in his correspondence with his friend Ermolao Barbaro.<sup>6</sup> Ermolao, a noble Venetian humanist, accused Pico of wasting his time with the reading of barbarian scholastic writers. Only the ancient philosophers deserve our interest, because their eloquent style reveals clear thought, while the bad Latin of the medieval authors is the reflex of their useless subtlety.<sup>7</sup> Pico answered with a long letter, defending the medieval philosophers against Ermolao's accusations. Certainly we must first of all follow the model of the ancient authors, but the scholastics are also full of precious doctrines and thought. We must not care for the bad style, because for a philosopher the content is more important. Mere eloquence without intellectual content has less interest for the philosopher than a serious concept formulated without elegance of style. This correspondence between Pico and Ermolao,

3 *Opera* (Basileae, 1561), 944. Cf. my essay "La posizione storica di Marsilio Ficino," *Civiltà Moderna* (1933), 438-440.

4 Cf. Eugenio Garin, *Giovanni Pico della Mirandola* (Florence, 1937).

5 L. Dorez-L. Thuasne, *Pic de la Mirandole en France* (Paris, 1897).

6 Pico's letter to Ermolao is found in his *Opera* (Venice, 1498), VIII-VI. The same letter with Ermolao's preceding letter and answer is printed in Poliziano's *Opera* (Lugduni, 1550), I, 252 ff.

7 *Op. cit.*, 252; cf. 268 ff.

which had its posthumous epilogue in a fictitious letter to Pico written in the name of Ermolao by Melanchthon to defend the value of rhetoric,<sup>8</sup> is extremely significant. Ermolao calls himself a modern Aristotelian who tries to oppose the original Aristotle to his later interpreters, but he made no positive philosophical contribution, but only perpetuated the position of early humanism against scholasticism.<sup>9</sup> Pico, although himself a humanist, defended the scholastics against humanism, philosophy against rhetoric, content against form. The old contrast of humanism and scholasticism had thus passed into the humanistic movement itself so that Pico, not Ermolao, represented the more progressive position. For when humanism became philosophical, scholasticism had to be absorbed as an element of philosophical tradition.

Quite different is the common opinion about Ficino. Giuseppe Saitta, in his monograph, described him as a pure representative of modern thinking in contrast with the tradition of scholastic theology.<sup>10</sup> Giuseppe Toffanin formulated the paradoxical statement that humanism was a reaction of Christian feeling against the heretical tendencies of scholasticism and based his thesis especially upon Ficino's concept of *docta pietas*.<sup>11</sup> Those modern interpreters of Pico, like Anagnine and Garin, who had clearly recognized the scholastic element in his writings, asserted that he was just for that reason not a mere representative of Platonism and the Florentine Academy; and they drew a distinction between Pico, the scholastic thinker, and Ficino, the Christian humanist and writer.<sup>12</sup>

I cannot accept this judgment as to Ficino. Certainly there are many differences between Pico and Ficino; but Ficino is not a mere humanistic writer or free from all scholastic influences. He never launched a general polemic against scholasticism, and when he attacked Averroism in the fifteenth book of his *Theologia Platonica*, he represented not only humanistic but also scholastic tradition. He frequently quoted Aristotle, and sometimes the scholastics, especially Thomas Aquinas, with great respect. There is a tradition that he accurately studied

8 Melanchthon, *Elementa Rhetorices* (Vitebergae, 1561), 187 ff.

9 An edition of Ermolao's letters and of his tract *de coelibatu* is now prepared for the first time by Vittore Branca.

10 G. Saitta, *La filosofia di Marsilio Ficino* (Messina, 1923).

11 G. Toffanin, *Storia dell'umanesimo* (Naples, 1933), 216 ff.

12 E. Anagnine, *Pico delle Mirandola* (Bari, 1937); Garin, *op. cit.*

in his youth Thomas' *Summa contra Gentiles*,<sup>13</sup> and he really knew this author very well. The whole *Theologia Platonica*, his principal work, is in the form of a *Summa de immortalitate animorum*, and is composed in all its parts after the scholastic scheme of demonstration, enumerating a great number of single arguments for (or sometimes against) a given statement. Important concepts and propositions are directly derived from the scholastics, like those of *essentia* and *esse*, *perfectio*, hierarchy of being, and natural order. Other important theories of Ficino contain clearly scholastic elements like those of the *primum in aliquo genere* or the *appetitus naturalis*.<sup>14</sup> Whoever reads some pages of the *Theologia* can not but notice this scholastic element. And the reason for it is the same as in the case of Pico. Early humanism did not furnish any philosophical concept, method or system, but only general tendencies and orientations. Whoever wanted to study philosophy was driven to return to the only philosophical tradition then existing, *i. e.* scholasticism. The germ of this attitude is already contained in an early tract of Ficino which has an exclusively humanistic character, but concludes with the following words: "The studies of humanity made you eloquent . . . those of philosophy will make you become God."<sup>15</sup> This distinction between *humanitatis studia* and *philosophia* hardly could exist in the mind of the early humanists. Here we find already the same motive developed as by Pico in his letter to Ermolao.

These statements are clearly confirmed by some newly discovered texts of Ficino which indeed prompted the thesis just set forth. While engaged in searching for humanistic materials in a small and nearly unknown collection, I found a manuscript described in the catalogue as containing some philosophical works of Ficino. I examined it and found that it contains a group of unpublished and unknown tracts which I hope to present soon in a critical edition. The manuscript has forty-four leaves, the last two of which are white; and it is written on paper, in the second half of the fifteenth century, by the same hand (possibly the last text ff. 41<sup>v</sup>-42<sup>v</sup> was added by a second hand, but about the same time). It is a clear humanistic hand, but there are many abbreviations of philosophical

<sup>13</sup> *Supplementum Ficinianum* (Florentiae, 1937), II., 204.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. my essay, "La teoria dell'appetito naturale in Marsilio Ficino," in *Giornale critico della filosofia italiana* (1937), 234 ff.

<sup>15</sup> *Supplementum Ficinianum*, II, 6.



terms. The manuscript is certainly not the autograph and has several faults in the text. After ff. 5, 10, and 15 there are traces that two vellum leaves were cut away without the loss of text. On the first page we read a table of Aristotelian categories, then a short encomium of Aristotle and some memorial verses. There follows ff. 1-1<sup>v</sup> a letter of Marsilio Ficino to Michael Miniatensis. It is the dedication to the following tract on dialectic and philosophy. On ff. 1<sup>v</sup>-5<sup>v</sup> is the first tract entitled *Summa philosophiae*. It contains a division of philosophy, then a survey on Aristotle's logical works as parts of dialectic, and at last a great number of logical definitions taken in great part from Aristotle and listed without any order. There is also a memorial verse (f. 4). This is the tract dedicated to Michael Miniatensis. On ff. 5<sup>v</sup>-9 there is a treatise, entitled *tractatus physicus*, which consists of physical definitions taken from Aristotle and other authors, and of a statement about *actus* and *motus*. On ff. 9-12 there is a tract *de Deo natura et arte*. God and matter are the extremes of all existent things, as *actus purus* and *potentia pura*, while all other things constitute an hierarchical order between them. As the artist has in his mind the forms of his works, so God those of all things. On ff. 12-17<sup>v</sup> follows a tract *de anima*. The soul is defined, after Aristotle, as the form of the body, but at the same time it is considered as an incorporeal substance. It has four powers: *vegetativa*, *sensitiva*, *motiva*, and *intellectiva*. The intellectual power is immortal. On ff. 17<sup>v</sup>-19 there is another bit of physical definitions without title. On ff. 19-22 we have another *tractatus physicus*. The author quotes the opinions of some early philosophers about the principles of the world, proves that the elements cannot be first principles and states then that matter, form and privation are the real principles of all things. On ff. 22-40<sup>v</sup> we find *Quaestiones de luce et aliae multae*, i. e., a list of questions about light, sound, the different sensations, etc. Then we have on ff. 40<sup>v</sup>-41<sup>v</sup>, without a title, statements about the senses, and at last on ff. 41<sup>v</sup>-42<sup>v</sup> another *divisio philosophiae* which is similar to that in the beginning but offers some differences. This text seems to be incomplete at the end.

There can be no doubt as to the authenticity of the tracts. The name of Ficino is found in the address of the dedication letter as well as in most of the titles, always written by the same contemporary hand. His friend, Michael Mercatus of San-



miniato, is known to us by several other testimonials.<sup>16</sup> Also the contents do not offer anything in contrast with Ficino's authorship. Certainly the single tracts are separated, because the dedication refers only to the first one. But they form, on the other hand, a connected group and once the author refers in a tract to a preceding one.<sup>17</sup> As to the date, we have only approximate indications. We do not find any reference to other writings, and in his other works Ficino does not refer to our tracts nor does he list them in the three catalogues of his works compiled by himself.<sup>18</sup> Only two later biographers seem to mention the *quaestiones de luce*, but it is not perfectly certain.<sup>19</sup> In every way the whole group must be assigned to Ficino's earlier period. Not only the Aristotelian contents, but also the loose composition, the great number of quotations without order and the memorial verses, correspond to the mentality of a young student. It also is clear that the author does not know Greek. Ficino was born in 1433, his first known composition was written in 1455, his first dated Latin tracts are from 1457.<sup>20</sup> Accordingly I am inclined to put our tracts about 1455 or to accept the biographer Caponsacchi's date given for the tract *de luce*, i.e., 1454.<sup>21</sup>

As to the contents and character of the texts, the most remarkable fact, as I said, is the strongly scholastic element we find in them. The name of Aristotle occurs on nearly every page, entire passages are mere quotations taken from his various works which the author demonstrates he knows very well. Aristotelian influences may be observed also in another sense. In the *Summa philosophiae*, the consideration about dialectic is a simple survey of Aristotle's logical works. The definition of the soul in the tract *de anima* is taken from Aristotle's work *de anima*.<sup>22</sup> The discussion about the elements and the introduction of *materia forma* and *privatio* as principles are derived

16 *Op. cit.*, II, 322.

17 f. 12v (*hoc vero in novem predicamenta ut supra dictum est dividitur*) refers to f. 2v.

18 For these catalogues, cf. *Suppl. Fic.*, I, 1-4.

19 Caponsacchi and the anonymous biographer mention certain "*dubbi intorno alla visione*," dedicated by young Ficino to his friend Antonio Serafico; cf. *Suppl. Fic.*, I, CLXII-CLXIII.

20 A. Della Torre, *Storia dell' Accademia Platonica di Firenze* (Florence, 1902), 507ff.

21 *Suppl. Fic.*, *ibid.*

22 *Anima est actus substantialis <corporis> physici organici potentia vitam habentis*, (f. 12). Cf. Aristotle, *de anima*, II, 1, 412a19.

from Aristotle's *Metaphysics*.<sup>23</sup> The whole group of questions refers to the second book of his *de anima*. And the young •Ficino not only shows a direct knowledge of Aristotle's works, but also a truly scholastic tradition and education. • The most quoted author after Aristotle is Averroes, the Arabic commentator. Once Ficino quotes Avicenna and opposes to him the opinion of Averroes and of the *Philosophi moderni*.<sup>24</sup> Once he quotes Porphyry,<sup>25</sup> and once Ghilbertus,<sup>26</sup> i.e., Porphyry's *Isagoge* and Gilbertus Porretanus' *de sex principiis*, the two writings which formed, together with some Aristotelian works, the *ars vetus*, the logical schoolbook of the Middle Ages. Scholastic is the definition of God as *actus purissimus*, the Peripatetic description of the intellect as *tabula rasa*, the distinction between *intellectus agens* and *intellectus possibilis*, and many other particulars. The whole form of the *quaestiones*, referred to an Aristotelian text, founded on Aristotle's authority,<sup>27</sup> beginning with fixed formulas,<sup>28</sup> and executed in a static form of argumentation, is closely connected with scholastic tradition. Besides these scholastic features, we have also other elements witnessing to Ficino's further development. Plato is quoted much less than Aristotle, but nearly as often as Averroes, and the young Ficino seems to know only three of his works, i. e. *Timaeus*, *Phaedo* and *Phaedrus*, all of which were translated.<sup>29</sup> Once he quoted Proclus' *elementatio theologica*, also translated by William of Moerbeke,<sup>30</sup> and in the *divisio philosophiae* he revealed Cicero's influence by listing *De Finibus* and *De Officiis* as parts of moral philosophy. But his admiration for Plato was greater than his direct knowledge. Already in the dedication he spoke of *Plato noster*, and elsewhere he asserted that his authority was the greatest.<sup>31</sup> And

23 *Metaphysics*, XII, 2 ff.

24 ff. 34-34v.

25 f. 7v.

26 f. 22.

27 *Quod est contra Aristotelem*, f. 35v.

28 For instance, *Dubitatur utrum lux in sole sit virtus activa necne et arguitur primo quod non*, f. 23.

29 The *Timaeus* was translated by Chalcidius, *Phaedo* and *Phaedrus* by Leonardo Bruni; cf. Hans Baron, *Leonardo Bruni Aretino humanistisch-philosophische Schriften* (Leipzig-Berlin, 1928); a complete bibliography of humanistic translations of Plato before Ficino is prepared by Ludwig Bertalot.

30 *Proclus in sua theologica declaratione*, f. 39. For the translation, cf. A. Pelzer, in M. De Wulf, *Histoire de la philosophie medievale* (Louvain-Paris, 1936), II, ed. 6, 48.

31 *Platonis auctoritas que quidem maxima est omnium*, f. 16.

in the *divisio philosophiae*, he emphasized the fact that the Platonists believed in celestial souls. As for Petrarch, as we said, Plato's name is for the young Ficino a symbol, before he knew him intimately. On the other hand, his admiration for Plato did not diminish that for Aristotle, and Ficino insisted twice on the essential identity of their opinions.<sup>32</sup> It is also characteristic of young Ficino that he tried to reconcile Aristotelian and Platonic tradition in two points where he later espoused a clear Platonic position. Accordingly, adopting Aristotle's definition of the soul as *forma corporis*, he insisted at the same time that it was a non-corporeal substance.<sup>33</sup> And admitting that perception is passivity, he asserted at once it is not properly passivity.<sup>34</sup> Important for him was the theory of God and matter as extremes of all existent things, probably of Neoplatonic derivation, which was not openly repeated in his later works, although it left some traces in them.<sup>35</sup> Important was also the analogy between God and the artist developed in the *Theologia Platonica*,<sup>36</sup> or the statement that language in general is a natural and common quality of man, but that a given language depends on particular, artificial factors.<sup>37</sup>

When we ask for the direct sources for this scholastic influence, I cannot suggest any definite name. In general, I agree with the Polish scholar, Heitzman, who stated for the first time that Ficino must have depended upon some Florentine theological tradition,<sup>38</sup> for Ficino did not leave Florence at any time for studies, as it is sometimes asserted.<sup>39</sup> Perhaps further researches will bring us some more concrete solution. There is Niccolo Tignosi of Foligno, an Aristotelian philosopher, who has been said to have been the master of Ficino, and who was recently studied by Lynn Thorndike.<sup>40</sup> There is Antonio degli Agli, a theologian and a friend of Ficino, some of whose tracts perhaps will be published by Hans Baron. There is Laurentius

32 *Plato et Aristoteles idem fere sentiunt*, f. 12; *Platonem sequi nunquam amplius formidantes ac etiam Aristoteli inherentes*, f. 17.

33 ff. 12 ff.

34 ff. 14v-15.

35 ff. 9 ff.; cf. *Opera* (Basileae, 1561), 349.

36 *Theol. Plat.*, II, 13; IV, 1; XIII, 3.

37 ff. 31-31v; cf. *Opera*, 324.

38 *Bulletin Internationale de l'Académie Polonaise de sciences et lettres* (1932), 18ff. (1933), 35ff.

39 *Civiltà Moderna* (1938), 282 f.

40 *Science and Thought in the Fifteenth Century* (New York, 1929), 161 ff.; and 308 ff.

Pisanus, author of philosophical dialogues, recently examined by Augusto Mancini and Cardinal Giovanni Mercati.<sup>41</sup>

I can not say that they were Ficino's masters or sources, but their works show the existence of another current in Florence at that time, *i.e.*, a philosophical and theological tradition of medieval character, more or less influenced by the new humanistic tendencies, but quite different from them. There may be found the historical roots of Ficino's philosophy, because the rising of the Florentine Academy can not be explained in any way from the early humanists like Salutati, Bruni, or Poggio.

In conclusion, the direct influence of the Florentine Academy comprehends not only the local Platonic tradition continued at Florence and Pisa with Diacceto, Verino, and others until the end of the sixteenth century, but also many other thinkers of the Italian and French Renaissance. Its indirect influence, caused by Ficino's translations and commentaries on Plato and the Neoplatonists, continued until the end of the eighteenth century and may still be discerned in many English and German philosophers of that period. But its influence was not confined to philosophy. We find it in all the poetry and literature about love in Italy and France in the sixteenth century and recently very much studied.<sup>42</sup> And we find it too, more or less explicitly in Servetus and in some of the Italian reformers, as we shall learn from new researches of Bainton and Cantimori.

Considering all that, it would be easy and interesting to assert that Ficino was not the first speculative thinker of the Italian Renaissance as he was hitherto believed to be, but was only one of the last scholastics. One could likewise assert that young Ficino was a mere scholastic, and that he passed through a profound crisis which brought him to Platonism and modern feeling. Both assertions would be sensational, but not exact. We merely conclude that besides the influence of Plato and the Neoplatonists, and besides the modern motives suggested to Ficino by his century and by his own personality, there was a third element in his thought, *i.e.*, the medieval, scholastic tradition. This fact could also be derived from his other works, but it

41 A. Mancini, in *Bollettino storico pisano* (1932), I, 33 ff.; Giov. Card. Mercati, *Codici latini Pico Grimani Pio* (*Studie e testi*, 75, Città del Vaticano, 1938), 98 ff. and 274 ff.

42 Walter Moench, *Die italienische Platonrenaissance und ihre Bedeutung fuer Frankreichs Literatur und Geistesgeschichte* (Berlin, 1936); Nescia A. Robb, *Neoplatonism of the Italian Renaissance* (London, 1935).

is seen more clearly from his newly discovered early tracts. His own feeling suggested to Ficino the general tendency of his speculation, the starting points, the preference for certain problems; to Plato and the Neoplatonists he owed many propositions, formulas, speculative solutions; but from the scholastic tradition he took many of the forms of his thinking, especially the metaphysical terminology and the logical method or procedure of his argumentation. This fact is wholly in accordance with the laws of historical process. Humanism began as a non-philosophical reaction against scholasticism, and in order to become philosophical speculation, it had to absorb the scholastic tradition of the Middle Ages.

## ORIGEN AND THE REGULAE FIDEI<sup>1</sup>

ALBERT C. OUTLER

*Duke University, Durham, N. C.*

It is certainly no compliment nowadays to call a man a "speculative theologian." It was even less so in the early centuries of the Christian era. For "speculative theology" is that kind of religious thought which is relatively indifferent to the realm of history and human events and which proposes postulates and principles which are regarded as *a priori*, having no necessary connection with history. This viewpoint, reflected in Marcion and the Gnostics, was one of the primary issues which led to their condemnation by the early church. Yet it is by no means an exceptional view which regards Origen primarily as a "speculative theologian," as one who scorned the simple faith of the Christians around him, and who mingled theology and philosophy together in such fashion that the truth and simplicity of the primitive Gospel were distorted and obscured. The redress of such an exaggeration would involve us deeply in the pivotal question of the relation, in Origen's thought, between theology and philosophy. Despite prolonged debate,<sup>2</sup> this problem can hardly be regarded as settled. Nor does this paper propose to attempt such a settlement. Rather it will confine itself to a much less ambitious but nevertheless prior question: how do the doctrinal norms in Origen's thought compare or contrast with what we know of similar basic beliefs in the Christian thought of his own and immediately preceding periods? An answer to this ought to afford preliminary data for the determination of the broader issue noted above and might, in itself, throw some light on the sense, if any, in which Origen may justly be called a "speculative theologian."

In the second century there began to appear, in many Chris-

<sup>1</sup> Gustave Bardy's "La règle de foi d'Origène," in *Recherches de science religieuse*, IX (1919), 162-96; and Van den Eynde, D., *Les normes de l'enseignement chrétien* (Paris: Gabalda & Fils, 1933), 298-311.

<sup>2</sup> Völker, W., *Das Vollkommenheitsideal des Origenes* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1931), 1-21, for a summary of the variety of opinion, in Origenistie research, upon this point.



tian writings, short summaries of belief, objectively stated, which were called variously "the canon of truth," "the preaching of the church," *regulae fidei*, etc. These were distillations, so to say, of the *paradosis*, that complex of authoritative teaching which had been handed down in the church by the apostles and their successors. Such summaries tended not only to set the bounds of theological speculation, but also to lay the foundation for the eventual elaboration of Christian dogma in the ecumenical creeds. The *regulae* are not to be identified simply with the baptismal symbol, although between them there is a close parallel evolution. The primary distinction between them appears to have been that the symbol was a liturgical formula of initiation, and hence relatively rigid in form because of its function. The *regulae* exhibit more flexibility and variation than the baptismal symbol and appear to have been minimum statements of the common faith which a given writer was willing to accept as the dogmatic focus of his theological exposition. Like the symbol, they also served to distinguish Catholic doctrine from all heresy.

There are six authors before Origen whose writings contain one or more versions of this "rule of faith." They are Ignatius, Aristides, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Hippolytus. Besides these there are shorter passages, similar in form to the other *regulae*, in the creed against Noetus ascribed to the "Elders of Ephesus," and the so-called *Canons of Hippolytus*, which is certainly not from Hippolytus of Rome, but is more likely of Alexandrine provenance.<sup>3</sup> The first thing we notice about them all is their striking similarity, their tireless repetition of the "facts" of the life of Jesus and their consistent emphasis upon the historical rootage of the Christian faith. They are in conscious and direct contrast to religious speculation which pretended to conserve the Christian spirit and idea,

<sup>3</sup> All of these "rules," except that of Hippolytus, may be examined in Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der alten Kirche* (Breslau: E. Morgenstern, 1897), 1-10. There is some question as to whether or not the extended exposition of Hippolytus (*Elenchos*, X, 32-3, in *Die Griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller* [hereafter referred to as *GCS*], III, 288-92) may be considered as a typical "rule." Although its form is somewhat unlike all the others, it is, nevertheless, an effort at defining the common substance of Christian profession and thus is akin in function, if not in form, to earlier *regulae*. Moreover, it dates from approximately Origen's own time; the margin of one manuscript has the words "Origen and Origen's opinions," an incidental testimony to the similarity between this ἀπόδειξις and the *regula* which stands at the beginning of the *De Principiis*.

but which denied or ignored the affirmations which the Gospels make concerning the life, death, resurrection, and the coming judgment of Jesus Christ.

God is One, Almighty Father. He, and not any inferior demiurge, created the world. Jesus Christ is "Son of God," "Lord," "Savior," "Word." The Spirit is "Holy," and is associated primarily with the inspiration of the prophets. The Virgin Birth is affirmed by all the forms save the fragmentary versions of the "Presbyters of Ephesus" and the so-called *Canons of Hippolytus*; all but these affirm the passion, resurrection, judgment. All omit any reference to the teachings of Jesus or the ethical virtues. Of these *regulae* those of Ignatius, Aristides, and Justin Martyr (together with the two fragmentary versions noted above) are products of Christian thought in the East. Tertullian's is representative, especially in form, of the hardening doctrinal concepts in the West. Irenaeus and Hippolytus (the last Latin father to write in Greek) show traces of influence from both East and West. Comparison of types yields the impression that, up to this time, at least, the *paradosis* was more flexible and less stereotyped in the East than in the West. It would be only natural, therefore, to expect to find in Origen, the most typical of the Greek fathers, a much less rigid and variable treatment of the tradition than in Irenaeus or Tertullian. An actual examination reveals, however, that the contrast is not nearly so great as might be anticipated.

Origen prefaces his systematic treatise on Christian metaphysics with a summary statement of the articles of faith which are, as he says, universally taught in the church and which owe their authority to the "teaching of the church, transmitted in orderly succession from the Apostles."<sup>4</sup> Elsewhere in his writings there are other versions of this dogmatic nucleus and throughout his works, as we have them, there are numerous references to the "rule of truth," "rule of faith," the rule of piety," and a "full faith." We may raise two questions with respect to these passages and answer them in turn.

The first concerns the authenticity of these passages. Here, as in almost every other aspect of Origenistic research, one must look, with critical suspicion, at the Latin translations of Rufinus. This does not mean that one need accept De Faye's contention

<sup>4</sup> *De Principiis*, praef., 2.

that these translations are of no more value than secondary sources.<sup>5</sup> It is, nevertheless, rather clear that on the precise point we are considering, at least, Rufinus errs grossly on the side of orthodoxy. The phrases in question occur in the Latin translations with a frequency out of all proportion to similar references in the Greek originals. This is a suspicious contrast and suggests inevitably that a great many of the Latin phrases are nothing more than pious asides interpolated by Rufinus at points he felt appropriate. We must, therefore, discount many of these casual references. We cannot dismiss, however, with equal assurance, the longer passages in the Latin translations which undertake to define the substance of the rule of faith. When, further, we find in the Greek texts extended versions which serve as controls for the Latin texts, we are forced to the conclusion that Origen did know and use a summary of minimum essentials of normative Christian belief.

The second question deals with the substance of the versions we have reason to believe are authentic. Let us begin with the longest Greek text. It is in the *Commentary on John*, where Origen develops the essentials of a "full faith," and suggests that anyone who believes less than this fails, by just so much, of having a perfect faith and the salvation which such faith brings.

... for the sake of clearness we will make the following declaration. Believe first of all that there is one God, the creator and perfecter of all things, who has made out of nothing everything which has come to be. And it is necessary to believe that Jesus Christ is Lord, and to maintain all the truth concerning both His divinity and His humanity. It is also necessary to believe in the Holy Spirit and that we, being free, are punished for our own sins and are recompensed for what we do that is good. If anyone appears to believe in Jesus but does not believe that there is but one God of the Law and the Gospel of whom the firmament showeth His handiwork, being the product of His hands, this one is throwing aside a very important chapter of the faith, and, again, if someone believes that he who was crucified under Pontius Pilate is a holy being and saviour of the world, but not that he was born of the Virgin Mary, this one also lacks something very necessary for holding the faith. Again, if one accepts His divinity, but, finding difficulty in His humanity, should believe that His life had no human element and that He did not become a person, this one likewise falls short of the faith not an inconsiderable degree. If, on the other hand, he should accept the human element, but

<sup>5</sup> *Origène, sa vie, son oeuvre, sa pensée* (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1923), I, 62-3 et passim.

reject the hypostasis of the only begotten and first born of all creation, this one also could not say that he held the faith.<sup>6</sup>

We may place beside this another significant passage (this one in Latin) in the *Commentary on Matthew*. Those who truly believe,

... do not dissent on these public and manifest items: to know the one God who gave the Law and Gospel and also Christ Jesus, first born of the creatures of the universe, who, at the end of the age, according to the preaching of the prophets came to earth and took upon himself the true nature of human flesh, being born of the Virgin, who underwent the death of the cross and was resurrected from the dead and deified the human nature which he had assumed (*deificavit quam susceperat humanam naturam*); and also the Holy Spirit, the same who had been in the Patriarchs and the Prophets and has since been given to the Apostles; and the resurrection from the dead; they believe all this as the church teaches it with certitude and all that is handed down in the church.<sup>7</sup>

Note the dependence upon authority.

Equally significant is another rarely noticed Greek text in which Origen speaks of "the ecclesiastical doctrine" concerning the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, divine providence, the resurrection, the judgment, and the "ecclesiastical canon."<sup>8</sup> Here the term "canon" apparently refers to the Scriptures.

In the *Commentary on the Epistle to Titus*, Origen defines the rule of faith, this time in direct negation to existing heretical notions. In order to make clear what the term "heretic" implies, he undertakes to show what the "full faith" is from which the heretics depart. Specifically, he proscribes such views as those of Marcion, Valentinus, Basilides, the Tethiani, and Apelles. A man is a heretic, likewise, if he falters in his Christological belief and denies either the humanity or the divinity of Jesus Christ. The Patripassians are heretics. The Virgin Birth, the pre-existence of Christ, the Holy Spirit, and moral freedom are defined as articles of faith and the passage ends as follows: "Whoever attempts to alter or overthrow any items that we have mentioned above, sins like a lost man and is self-condemned, according to the judgment of the Apostle

6 XXXII, 15, 16, in *GCS*, IV, 451-52.

7 *Series* 33 (852), in *GCS*, XI, 61, lines 1-11.

8 *Homily on I Cor.*, 4 (C. Jenkins, ed., in *Journal of Theological Studies*, IX [1908], 234). This passage is significant because it resembles the Eastern *regulae* in form, but is closer to the Western *regulae* as far as the specification of items of faith is concerned.

[Paul]. We, too, must obey this command and thus estimate such an one."<sup>9</sup> To this Origen appends the statement that the "full faith" of the true churchman includes the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, the existence and evil power of the devil and his angels, adding that the devil himself possesses moral freedom.

In the *Commentary on Romans*, he speaks of the heretics who are called Christians, but who are really blind leaders of the blind because they hang onto the Law and because they profess to teach mysteries which are hidden from the rest of the church. Therefore, he says, their minds follow perverse expositions and thus they pollute the pure and proper dogmas of the church (*casta et honesta ecclesiae dogmata maculant*).<sup>10</sup> Elsewhere in the same work, he distinguishes his own teaching from that of the Gnostics and adds: "indeed, we leave in their impiety Basilides and those like him who think thus (*i. e.*, in free speculation), for we, like the Apostle, are steering our thought *secundum pietatem ecclesiastici dogmatis*."<sup>11</sup>

In the *Contra Celsum*, Origen points proudly to the widespread acquaintance of the whole world with the distinctive Christian tenets and specifies the Virgin Birth of Jesus, His crucifixion, death, resurrection, and the general judgment which is to come.<sup>12</sup>

Again in the Greek text of the *Commentary on John*,<sup>13</sup> he speaks of "the rule by which the mass of the people is guided," as being the sufficient safeguard against heresy. This cannot be interpreted to mean that Origen personally contemned such a rule, but only that he felt that beyond this rule of simple faith there was a higher stage of rational wisdom. Another testimony to his belief in the fundamental importance of the common faith of the church may be found in *In Matth. Comm.*, Series 46 and 137.<sup>14</sup>

Thus far we have referred only in passing to the *locus classicus* in the preface to the *De Principiis*. It is too well known to require extended citation. It is important to note, however, that Koetschau, certainly one of the most critical of

<sup>9</sup> In *Epistolam ad Titum*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, XIV, col. 1303-05.

<sup>10</sup> V, 1 (549), in *PG*, XIV, col. 1015.

<sup>11</sup> V, 8 (561), in *PG*, XIV, col. 1058. Notice the reference to baptism.

<sup>12</sup> I, vii.

<sup>13</sup> XIII, in *GCS*, IV, 240, lines 9-15.

<sup>14</sup> In *GCS*, XI, 94, lines 26-30; 282, lines 6-7.



all Origen's editors, agrees that this passage is in the main an accurate representation of the Greek original, with interpolations and expansions by Rufinus which do not, however, seriously obscure the meaning.<sup>15</sup>

It is difficult to imagine any external compulsion which would have required Origen to preface his *cours de theologie philosophique*, very likely prepared for his advanced classes in the catechetical school at Alexandria, with a "rule of faith" alleged to be the basis of his systematic thought and teaching. We know that he was not intimidated by the "orthodoxasts" as Clement had been, and he was certainly not the sort of man who would have thrown a sop to Cerberus. This rule of faith must, therefore, be taken as a *bona fide* confession, or else the task of understanding Origen as a man or as a theologian becomes almost impossible. The clearest implication of this preface is that Origen had come to fear the intellectual consequences of either subjective faith or speculative reason unless they were controlled by some objective canon and oriented, by initial commitment, to these objective truths. In series, Origen defines the orthodox Christian belief in God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit, the human soul, the devil and evil powers, the creation of the world *ex nihilo*, the inspired Scriptures, and, finally, angels and good powers. Very significant is the care with which Origen points out the places where, on the one hand, the tradition was clear and definite, and where, on the other hand, he felt that there were areas of legitimate speculation which might serve to clarify and extend the meaning of the items of the rule. It is interesting to note a similar distinction in Tertullian's *regula* in *The Prescription of Heretics*, xiv.

This version of the *regula fidei* in the *De Principiis* is extremely interesting, both on account of what it contains and what it omits. It is quite as emphatic as the Western *regulae* on the articles concerning God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit, and in its insistence upon the historical facts of Jesus' life and death. There is, however, no reference to the *parousia*, which is mentioned in the rules of Irenaeus and Tertullian, and in almost every version of the baptismal symbol (Cyprian and Novatian being the exceptions). It specifies the doctrine of the creation of the world *ex nihilo*, which is to be found in none

<sup>15</sup> *De Principiis*, in *GCS*, V, cxxxviii.



of the other rules except that of Tertullian. It asserts the doctrine of free-will and of morally responsible souls, a point not specifically touched upon in any of the other *regulae*. It defends, as part of the tradition, the legitimacy of the allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures, but makes it conditional upon an enlightenment by the grace of the Holy Spirit. Again be it noted that even here Origen is not far from Tertullian<sup>16</sup> who holds that the scriptures must be interpreted, not by themselves, but by the norms of the rule of faith. There is no mention of the Catholic church, the forgiveness of sins, or the communion of saints. There is no emphasis upon Jesus' teaching, His works of mercy and power, or the Kingdom of God. These points are discussed elsewhere in his work, however, and are not mentioned here, probably because they had not been called into question. The purpose of this rule is primarily to define the faith on those points at which the heretics, Ebionite or Gnostic, cavilled and to mark out the distinction between their and the orthodox doctrine of the church.

In addition to these relatively long versions of the rule, there are a large number of incidental references, the most important of which may be noted briefly. In *In Jeremiam Homilia* V, 4,<sup>17</sup> Origen uses the term "church canons" without specifying its content but identifying it with "the word of truth," and "the word of the church," and "the setting-forth of sound teachings." The clear inference is that he accepts the doctrinal authority of the "church canons," and that he identifies this with the basic *paradosis* of the church. In similar fashion, in the *Homily on I Corinthians*, fragment 74,<sup>18</sup> he speaks of "the canon of the church" as a sort of synonym for the apostolic preaching of "the word of God."

In the fourth book of the *De Principiis*<sup>19</sup> there is a passage, the Greek original of which is preserved in the *Philocalia*, in which Origen speaks of "the canon of the celestial church of Jesus Christ according to the succession of the Apostles." There has been a good deal of comment on the meaning of the phrase "canon of the celestial church" by Battifol, Bardy,

<sup>16</sup> *Op. cit.*, xiv.

<sup>17</sup> In *GCS*, III, 43-4.

<sup>18</sup> Jenkins, *op. cit.*, X, 1909, 42.

<sup>19</sup> In *GCS*, V, 308, lines 15-16.

Lebreton, Kattenbusch, and van den Eynde.<sup>20</sup> There is a way of reconciling all these views, it seems to me, if one recalls the meaning of a similar phrase of Origen, "the eternal Gospel."<sup>21</sup> This refers, in Platonic phrase, to the heavenly archetype of the historical Gospel, which transcends it, although it does not contradict it. Similarly, we may suppose that this "rule of the celestial church" refers to the rational archetype which is only partially exemplified in the existing rule of the churches. The former certainly does not contradict the latter; it is identical with the "wisdom among the perfect"; and, finally, it would naturally be the ultimate norm for the interpretation of the Scriptures.

Thus we complete our survey of the relevant texts in Origen's writings. There are numerous additional references in the Latin texts, none of which offers any further insight on the problem.

It is too much to say that Origen recast the rule of faith.<sup>22</sup> Rather he seems to have attempted deliberately to sum up all the doctrinal points on which there was general agreement in the church. To these he adds his own prime assumption of moral freedom and the probably popular belief in devils and angels. Doubtless he felt that the contemporary statements of Christian tradition were meager and fragmentary. Certainly he believed that one might fill in the gaps without altering the essence. At the same time, Origen turned to these summaries of belief as starting points for his own exercise in rational speculation. He was moving from faith to philosophy, and as a part of that process he was undertaking to transform statements born out of religious experience, affirmations suited to moments of worship, into extremely comprehensive and general conclusions about God, the world, and man. It is evident that in so doing he clearly overreached Catholic orthodoxy, but it is equally evident that he was not trying to cram philosophy into the Procrustean bed of an unphilosophical religious tradition. To Origen, the consensus of the belief of the church, based on the Scriptures and the oral tradition, was of paramount importance; his obvious intention was to use it everywhere as a

20 Cf. van den Eynde, *op. cit.*, p. 306-08, for a summary of the discussion.

21 *De Principiis*, III, vi, 8; IV, iii, 13 (25).

22 A. Harnack, *History of Dogma* (London, 1910), II, 12.

norm for his teaching.<sup>23</sup> By the same token he rejects the idea of a secret or esoteric tradition, transmitted by privileged initiates.<sup>24</sup> Origen's version of the rule of faith, even in its longest form, is very far from being a theological system and still further from being a metaphysic. Yet, it is the ground of his theology and metaphysics. It is indeed a *rule of faith*; it guides only those who believe that grace and truth come from the believer's relationship to Jesus Christ. It is not the end of a process of reasoning, inductive or deductive; there is no evidence in Origen's writings that he came to this "rule of faith" after an investigation of alternative positions. It is everywhere taken as given. Assent to it is the sole avenue of approach to the higher knowledge of God which reaches over and beyond simple faith.

We are thus led to a major conclusion in the determination of our original question: in Origen's thought the faith of the church holds a primary place; it is *sine quâ non* to the wider development of theological speculation, and is the beginning of that upward movement of the rational soul which, in its completion, brings one to that "wisdom among the perfect," characteristic of full salvation. His was a bold and original mind, but as far as his relation to the doctrinal norms of the church of his day is concerned, he was ἀνὴρ ἐκκλησιαστικός.

23 *De Principiis*, preface, in *GCS*, IV, 8: "One ought not to admit as true anything which differs from (*discordat*) the ecclesiastical and apostolic tradition." Cf. *In Matth. Comm.*, Series 39, in *GCS*, XI, 77, lines 25-29: "In order to be saved, one must remain in the ecclesiastical tradition and the ecclesiastical teaching (*ecclesiasticae traditionis et ecclesiasticae inductionis*) which have been proposed from the beginning." Cf. also, *ibid.*, 46, in *GCS*, XI, 94, lines 26-30.

24 *Contra Celsum*, I, vii.

## GOSSNER MISSIONARIES IN AMERICA

GEORGE B. ARBAUGH

*Carthage College, Carthage, Illinois*

When the great German immigration to America began, flooding across Pennsylvania, down the Ohio River, up into Ohio and Indiana, and out into the states west and north, it was impossible for the small American Lutheran Church to supply sufficient pastors for the care of these immigrants. Among others in Germany who were concerned about the need was Pastor Johannes Evangelista Gossner of Berlin. The men he sent to America have written an interesting, if not major, chapter in American church history.

Gossner was a remarkable man, having come to Protestant convictions while serving in the Catholic priesthood. On being forced to leave his work in Bavaria, he went for a time to Russia, then in 1826, back in Germany, he openly united with the evangelical church. Four years later he entered upon a very important ministry in Berlin, where his zeal bore fruit in hospital work, educational projects, home mission work, a great foreign mission society and missionary enterprise in India, the founding of a missionary paper, *Die Biene auf dem Missionsfelde*, and the sending of pastors to the Germans in America.

The thirty Gossner men in America reflected something of this zeal, although some of them do not appear to have been any too well trained. Many of them underwent great hardship, and a host of congregations are witness to the effectiveness of their ministry. These men were not only pioneers who helped to build a new nation in the settlements of the west, but also pioneers in a critical period of religious foundation laying. The Gossner men, on the whole, were not great men, but they helped to mould German-American Christianity along its familiar conservative lines, and in doing so took a vigorous part in the formation and reformation of denominations and synods which in that day were in a fluid state.

Among the first missionaries sent by Gossner to America

—six came in 1840—was Johann George Kunz, a rather significant figure. He and his friends were at once plunged into the trying problem of denominationalism. In Germany they had known the Prussian attempt at Protestant unification. This fact, and perhaps also Gossner's own varied denominational experience, explains the unusual fact that these men, on arriving in America, did not seem to have any clear-cut denominational consciousness. Indeed, Gossner sent his first men to the United Brethren people, in Baltimore, whose loud, emotional revivals mystified and perplexed the newcomers. After a few months of turmoil of spirit, Kunz left the United Brethren and joined a Mennonite group of "River Men," whose soft, plaintive tones were a relief after the revival shoutings. But Kunz soon turned against what seemed sectarianism in this group also, and sought out certain Lutheran ministers by whom he was sent to Fort Wayne, Indiana, to care for the congregation there while its pastor, Wyneken, went to Germany to make his now rather famous appeal for pastors for the emigrating Germans.<sup>1</sup>

When Kunz came to Indianapolis, then a town of two thousand inhabitants, he was urged by the English-speaking Lutheran pastor and also by the Germans of the community to remain there and organize a German church, which he finally consented to do. Following the Prussian pattern, he gathered the German Lutherans and Reformed into a mixed church. For a salary of \$225 per year he not only served these people spiritually, but also, as was customary, conducted a parochial school for the children, three days a week.<sup>2</sup>

Some of the Gossner men remained in the East. Gottlieb Kranz, for example, spent his life chiefly in ministries at Weinberg, Ohio and Balm, Pennsylvania.<sup>3</sup> Likewise John and Heinrich Isensee worked in Pennsylvania. But a number went on west to Indiana, a land of virgin forests and occasional clearings. Johann Christian Schulze went first to East German-town and Hagerstown, Indiana, then later to Richmond, and still later had pastorates in Ohio. He visited with the other Gossner men who were near him, and in 1850 visited the Indianapolis Synod which they organized, but affiliated not with it but with the Joint Synod of Ohio. He and Kranz were among those who

1 H. M. Zorn, "Beginnings in Indianapolis," *Concordia Theological Monthly* (January, 1934), 19 ff.

2 *Lutherische Kirchenzeitung* (April 1, 1841; July 29, 1841).

3 Information furnished by Pastor H. J. Meleher, Grove City, Pa.



protested against the use of English instruction in the Columbus seminary. Schulze's report to Gossner<sup>4</sup> indicates that these men were really missionaries and not simply pastors. "In summer and autumn, when the roads are good, I also make missionary tours and seek out the scattered German sheep and direct them to Christ."

The remaining Gossner men in Indiana were even closer together in fellowship. Johann F. Isensee was sent to Wyneken in Fort Wayne, but like Kunz, stopped along the way and undertook a difficult ministry in two little churches at Brownstown, Indiana. "You know these log cabins," he wrote back to a friend in Pittsburgh. "An apple or a knife soon falls through a hole in the floor, and flies of all kinds are our unbidden guests. . . . We have a cow which, while not yet paid for, nevertheless gives us milk. . . ."<sup>5</sup>

While such problems of pioneering occupied much of the time of these men, doctrinal, and in particular synodical, problems soon were given much attention. In less than a year after his coming to Indiana we find Isensee writing to the *Lutherische Kirchenzeitung* of Pittsburgh to complain about the practices of another Lutheran pastor of his neighborhood. Yet he, like Kunz and most of the other Gossner men, sensed nothing wrong in having "*gemischte*" or "evangelical" churches of Lutherans and Reformed people. Kunz found that he could not secure financial aid in the East from the Lutherans for his mixed church in Indianapolis, owing to its denominational confusion. This led to his gathering the Lutheran element about him in a strictly Lutheran congregation. Isensee then became pastor of those in the mixed or evangelical church, and J. J. Meissner replaced Isensee at Brownstown. Meissner came to Indiana a year later, because he had spent a year in the Columbus seminary to learn English. Like the others, Meissner was disgusted with the liberalism of the Lutheran "Synod of the West" (affiliated with the General Synod) to which they all belonged, yet he too seems to have absorbed some of the revival religion of the time, for on September 9, 1845 he wrote to Gossner<sup>6</sup> that he had "saved" fifty souls, a rather odd statement in view of the fact that Isensee had just finished a pastorate in that

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Die Biene auf dem Missionsfelde* (No. 9, Sept., 1846), 71.

<sup>5</sup> Translated from his letter in *Lutherische Kirchenzeitung* (November, 1841).

<sup>6</sup> *Die Biene auf dem Missionsfelde* (August, 1846), 63.



community. Within a few months, Meissner became involved in a serious difficulty with his congregation and was forced to resign. We find him becoming increasingly insistent upon strict and conservative Lutheranism. In his next pastorate, at Harts Mills, Indiana, where he remained until 1850, he again came into violent conflict with the people whom he charged with non-Lutheran and liberalistic ideas and practices. Eventually, his uncompromising spirit forced him to leave, and his life was one of frequent change both of pastorates and synods; but throughout he remained aligned with the conservative forces of Lutheranism.<sup>7</sup>

F. W. Wier, who had settled in Dearborn county, Indiana, was experiencing equal and similar difficulties. He was pastor of four little congregations near Cincinnati, Ohio, but was opposed to what he described as rationalism, and also to Methodist practices. He soon was obliged to draw out the loyal Lutheran element and formed tiny churches out of these remnants. Hard pressed financially, he became agent for a free Catholic paper, and later served a non-Lutheran church for a time.<sup>8</sup>

In the meantime, significant changes occurred. In 1844 the Synod of the West convened in Fort Wayne, and Kunz was ordained by it. The next year he helped in a movement to make it more conservative by severing it from the liberal General Synod. When he found that the Synod of the West planned to re-enter the General Synod, Kunz and the other three Gossner men met in his church and founded a new body, the conservative Indianapolis Synod. J. F. Isensee, pastor of the evangelical church in Indianapolis, became its first president, and retained this position for many years. The ranks of the new synod were soon swelled by Gossner men. Th. Wichmann, who came from Germany in 1848, became pastor of a Lutheran-Reformed congregation in Cincinnati, and Matthies Düring, who came the same year, was received with him into the synod in 1849. Another Gossner man, Friedrich W. John, worked on a farm in Michigan for a year, and then in 1849 entered the Indianapolis Synod, succeeding Wier who had given up his impoverished parish. The prospects for this Gossner synod were

<sup>7</sup> *Der Lutheraner* (Oct. 29, 1850).

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* (Oct. 29, 1850); and *Lutherischer Kirchenbote* (May 9, 1851).

bright and it decided to send a missionary to establish churches in southern Indiana.

But trouble lay ahead. In 1847 Kunz reported the synod's proceedings rather encouragingly in the Missouri Synod's *Der Lutheraner* (Nov. 6, 1847). But in 1848 he failed to attend its convention, having arrived at the conviction that no Lutheran pastor should serve a mixed (Lutheran and Reformed) congregation, as was then customary in the Indianapolis Synod. But the synod insisted that Kunz should have come to uphold his views and pointed out that he himself had served a mixed congregation in the country until five weeks before the meeting, then giving up the church not because of reasons of conscience but because it no longer needed his service. *Der Lutheraner* championed Kunz's cause, charging the Indianapolis Synod with being not Lutheran since its pastors served "unirte" churches, and it quoted Luther rather effectively in the matter.<sup>9</sup>

Due to this agitation, the Indianapolis Synod ruled in 1849 that in the future no mixed church should be organized, but allowed—owing to a protest by Wier and another pastor—that a pastor might serve a previously organized mixed church if he had reason to hope that it would become Lutheran. *Der Lutheraner* of January 22, 1850 noted the improvement with satisfaction. Yet Kunz had already left the Indianapolis Synod and had joined the more conservative Missouri Synod. He and Isensee carried on a heated public correspondence in *Der Lutheraner*.<sup>10</sup> Kunz soon had to leave his parish and spent the remainder of his ministry in Missouri Synod congregations.

Kunz's influence continued to bear fruit. At its next session, Isensee himself reported that he had given up his evangelical church although he was still serving the Lutheran element in it. The synod, having at this time sixteen ordained pastors in twenty-one congregations, voted that no pastor might in the future accept a call to a mixed church.<sup>11</sup>

The slow adoption of conservative Lutheranism had hurt the synod greatly. Wichmann soon followed Kunz into the Missouri Synod, partly because of the refusal of the Indianapolis Synod to unite with Missouri which was rapidly growing into a very large body. F. W. John made the same move.

<sup>9</sup> Issue of Oct. 2, 1849.

<sup>10</sup> Issues of March 19, 1850; April 16, 1850.

<sup>11</sup> *Der Lutheraner* (Oct. 29, 1850).

Meissner left, not so much for doctrinal as for practical reasons, as did Wier. Thus the Indianapolis Synod which had such bright prospects at the time of its founding soon found itself weak and rather helpless. A large part of its laity had been lost through the abandonment of the union churches, and some of its ablest pastors and strong congregations had been lost to the Missouri Synod. As a result, in 1858, J. F. Isensee led his little group into the Joint Synod of Ohio, of which it became the Southern District. (The Joint Synod is now a part of the American Lutheran Church.) In this new Southern District we find another Gossner man, Carl Schadow, who had come to America in 1848, but who had gone to Waverly, Ohio, and only later became pastor of the strong church at Richmond, Indiana. Also Gottfried Löwenstein entered the new district. He had been sent by Gossner in 1858 and became a successful pastor in the joint Synod of Ohio.<sup>12</sup>

There were still other early Gossner men who had entered the Joint Synod of Ohio. One was A. F. Knappe who had been directed to Wyneken in Fort Wayne, and by whom he was placed at Decatur, Indiana, in 1841. Wyneken soon went into the Missouri Synod, but Knappe united with the Ohio group, perhaps through Schulze's influence, and served for almost two decades at Ridgeville Corners, Ohio. Robert J. Grätz came to America in 1844, took a year's work in the seminary at Columbus and began his work as pioneer pastor in Crawford County, Ohio, where he served four little congregations. Three other Gossner men in this synod, Johannes G. Sinke, Wilhelm Schmogrow (who first worked in the General Synod but left it because of its liberalism), and Herman Lemke, are rather isolated figures, Lemke eventually entering the Missouri Synod. Lemke, like Kunz and Wichmann, became a successful pastor in the Missouri Synod, but it was F. W. John who best stands for missionary pioneering by Gossner men in the Missouri Synod. After many brief pastorates in Indiana and Missouri, he went to the plains of Kansas and Nebraska, living in sod houses and "dugouts," riding horseback over miserable roads and where there were no roads, fording streams, living in abject poverty, and supporting himself largely by farming, while building up reasonably strong congregations.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Obituary in *Minutes of Northern District of the Joint Synod of Ohio* (1908).

<sup>13</sup> Information from Rev. W. Cook of Conway, Mo., husband of a grand-daughter of F. W. John.

Thus it appears that most of the Gossner men, either directly or through the Indianapolis Synod, went into the Joint Synod of Ohio, even though they were profoundly influenced by the Missouri Synod. Many of them appreciated Missouri conservatism, but were not attracted by what seemed to them its clashing dogmatism. A few of Gossner's men drifted into the little conservative Buffalo Synod, more or less by accident, a synod formed by people who had left Germany in 1839 rather than submit to the restrictions of the Prussian union church. The first Gossner man to join the Buffalo group was F. W. Wier, who left the Indianapolis Synod because of lack of financial support and who served a non-Lutheran church for a time. He is chiefly of interest as the founder of the first Lutheran church in St. Paul, Minnesota. Also he founded a church at Lake Elmo, Minnesota, braving the bitter cold on the Indian trails between the churches.<sup>14</sup> Meissner and Schadow also entered the Buffalo Synod, which eventually united with the Joint Synod of Ohio and the Iowa Synod to form the American Lutheran Church.

While there are some other men who are of interest as pastors,<sup>15</sup> there is only one other movement of Gossner men in the Lutheran church of America, and it involved an entirely unrelated group, the former Gossner missionaries in India. One of them, Ludwig H. Gerndt, was undoubtedly the most important of all the Gossner men in America. He went to India in 1849 with his brother Rudolph. Forced to leave India during the Sepoy mutiny in 1857, Ludwig Gerndt returned to Germany, then went to Canada in 1858 where he became the first Lutheran missionary in upper Ottawa. Enduring greatest hardships, he founded many churches, visiting them about once every four weeks. He went on foot through forests and thickets, in bake-oven heat in summer and winter's bitter cold,

<sup>14</sup> Information from the Rev. A. Haseley, Lake Elmo, Minn.

<sup>15</sup> B. J. Ansoerge came to the United States in 1870, went to the St. Louis seminary of the Missouri Synod and became the first pastor of that synod in Kentucky. H. Kleinhagen, who came to America in 1841, worked for a time in a weak German congregation in New Orleans, La. Johannes Lüpke came in 1886, worked in Joint Synod of Ohio and Iowa Synod congregations, and later practiced medicine (rubbing treatments) and sold insurance. F. W. Kitzki came in 1889 and returned to Germany after a short pastorate at Emerald, Nebraska. G. Endrulat likewise served in the German Nebraska Synod of the General Synod. I. Friedrich Grassow, one of the earliest men, worked at Evansville, Indiana, without affiliating with any synod. Still others may have come, but definite information is lacking.

carrying a heavy pack on his back which contained a little bread, Bibles, and literature. So it continued until the synod at last gave him a "*Missions-pferd*," after the said mission-horse had been for a time "laid on the table" by the synod but eventually purchased. Many flourishing congregations testify to Gerndt's ability and zeal.

While working in Canada, Gerndt was in the Canada Synod of the conservative Lutheran General Council, and when his health necessitated a less strenuous life he served General Council churches in the state of New York. In 1875 he was appointed chaplain at Ward's Island where impoverished and sick, or mentally defective, immigrants were cared for. Thousands of people were sent there every year and Gerndt's work there was of far-reaching significance in that time of tremendous German immigration. When the immigrants were removed from Ward's Island, Gerndt became general missionary to Germans in public institutions of New York. Throughout this time he was the best friend of the Gossner Mission Society in America, presenting its cause and seeking funds for its work. He died in 1905.<sup>16</sup>

C. Rudolph Gerndt left India a year before his brother's departure, owing to illness. After home mission work in Germany, he followed his brother to Canada, serving at Logan, Ontario, for a number of years; he then followed his brother to New York, eventually becoming city missionary at Rochester.<sup>17</sup>

Christian Behrens was another India missionary who came to Canada, where, in 1861, L. H. Gerndt placed him at Brant, Ontario. The following year he organized a church near there, at Hanover, and served these little log-church congregations until his retirement a few years later.<sup>18</sup>

Of the men so far mentioned, few would have dealings with the liberalistic General Synod (the first general Lutheran body in America). The one significant exception is Matheis Düring, whose experience adds a bit to our understanding of the conditions of the time. In 1852, at Marysville, Ohio, he found himself increasingly opposed by religious rationalism and

16 *Lutherische Kirchenblatt* (1884), 125, 134, 142, 150, 160.

17 I. Nieum, *Geschichte des Ev.-Luth. Ministeriums vom Staate New York*, 356.

18 *Die Wachende Kirche* (June, 1912); also *Jubilee Booklet Commemorating the 75th Anniversary of the Founding of St. Paul's Luth. Cong., Normanby, Ont.* (1934).



unbelief which crept into his congregation and eventually forced his resignation. He then organized the pious followers into a new congregation. The new immigrants were responsive, he said, but the wealthier Pennsylvania Germans were almost "*Heiden*." Sectarians and Catholics made his work difficult, cursing Luther.<sup>19</sup> However, he was not without fault himself, appearing to be defective, like a few other Gossner men, in education and training.

In general, the history of the Gossner men in America is one of a movement away from church unionism, and in the direction of conservative Lutheranism, and that too in spite of the fact that at the outset many of them were unionistic, pastors of evangelical churches. A few Gossner men actually went into the Evangelical Synod of North America, the American offshoot of the Prussian Union church; not so many, however, as might have been expected. C. Kuss, who came with Wichmann in 1848, momentarily was associated with the Evangelical Church in Cincinnati, but then drifted away.<sup>20</sup> One rather outstanding Gossner man, Oscar Lohr, came by accident into the Evangelical Church. He came to America from India because of the mutiny there, served Reformed churches in America, then returned to India and joined the Evangelical group when his mission was taken over by them. Around the year 1880 there were three men who entered Evangelical Synod: Richard Krause, Christian Buckisch, and Adolph Klingeberger.

There may also have been a few Gossner men in the ministry of other denominations. One at least is known, Oscar Lohr, who was ordained by the German Reformed Church after coming to America in 1858. For a time, like Buckisch, he went to India to work under the Gossner Society. On the whole, however, the Gossner men in America helped to build the conservative Lutheran church.

<sup>19</sup> *Lutherischer Kirchenbote* (Feb. 18, 1853).

<sup>20</sup> *Der Lutheraner* (Jan. 1, 1895).

## JOHN WESLEY'S GEORGIA MINISTRY

EDGAR LEGARE PENNINGTON

*Miami, Florida*

Philanthropy and religious idealism loomed high in the inception of Georgia. Doctor Thomas Bray, once Commissary of the Lord Bishop of London in Maryland, the motivating factor in the founding of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, the patron of parochial lending libraries for the colonies, and the ardent advocate of the education of the negro slave, had in his latter years associated himself with General James Edward Oglethorpe. The two had found a common interest in the need of prison reform; there is much reason to believe that Oglethorpe's concern over the hardships of the debtor prisoners was the result of his conferences with Doctor Bray. At any rate, when Doctor Bray received a legacy for the education of the Negroes in the colonies, Oglethorpe was one of the group later incorporated as the "Associates of Doctor Bray." There were several prominent Anglican clergymen among the trustees, as well as laymen of wealth and position. The original Associates did not constitute a colonising society; their objects were the founding of parochial libraries in England and the plantations and the Christian education of the Negro. When the colonisation of Georgia was undertaken, the enlarged group of Associates of Doctor Bray formed the nucleus of the Georgia Board of Trustees. The Associates included some eight individuals who never served as trustees of the new colony; but no one of the Board as first named was chosen from outside that composite charitable society. "At the head of its membership were three of the original group of Associates. There were fourteen members of Parliament, all of whom but Digby (and possibly Lowther) had served on at least the revised committee on the gaols, though three of the least active were omitted from the trust. There were seven clergymen (five of them trustees), and a fourth group of philanthropists, most of whom, with the clergymen, represented the movement out-

side of Parliament." For a while the Associates of Doctor Bray and the trustees of Georgia met as a single body, and even used the same minute book; even after the Georgia charter had passed the seals (June 9th, 1732), the business of the Associates and the trustees was for some time jointly enacted. But it was evident that a dual organization was evolving, and that the Bray Trust should be separated from the colonial enterprise; and at the meeting of May 31, 1733, application was made for a payment of the trust funds for the Negro schools and libraries, "to be separated from the care and management of the Georgia Trustees in general," as it was inexpedient that the accounts "be blended together." Yet the Associates continued to hold their meetings at the Georgia office; and annually, down to 1752, the Associates attended the anniversary sermons in honor of Doctor Bray in company with the Georgia Trustees. When the trustees took inventory of their effects in 1752, books belonging to the Bray Associates were found intermingled with those of the Georgia trust.<sup>1</sup>

While it is true that the military and strategic importance of the colony was recognised by men of state, it is certain that the altruistic appeal of the colony caught the popular fancy. The object was not merely to protect Carolina and the northern provinces from Spanish invasion, but to furnish a haven for impecunious debtors. From the outset, the new colony afforded a refuge not only for those who wished to begin life anew without the pressure of old pecuniary obligations but also for members of persecuted sects. The Salzburgers, driven from their homes because of their belief, were offered homes in Georgia. Thither flocked the Piedmontese and the Scotch Highlanders, conspicuous for their piety. Those who sponsored the colonisation of Georgia had no wild dreams of wealth. The Reverend Henry Herbert volunteered his services, and landed with the first shipload of colonists. On the twelfth of February, 1733, the group landed at Yamacraw Bluff on the Savannah River.

<sup>1</sup> The Anglican influences in the establishment of Georgia have become more and more recognised in recent years. Dr. Verner W. Crane has treated of the subject in the following publications: *Southern Frontier*, 309ff.; "The Philanthropists and the Genesis of Georgia" (*American Historical Review*, XXVII, 65ff.); "The Promotion Literature of Georgia" (*Bibliographical Essays, A Tribute to Wilberforce Eames*, 233ff.). See Pennington, Edgar L., "Anglican Influences in the Establishment of Georgia" (*Georgia Historical Quarterly*, XVI, 292ff., Dec., 1932).

Having offered thanksgiving to God for their prosperous voyage and safe arrival, they set about the work of building what is now the city of Savannah. Doctor Herbert remained only three months in the colony; on account of illness, he set sail for England, but died on the return voyage.

In the meantime, the trustees had found that the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts would make an allowance for a missionary in the new colony. On January 24, 1733, they wrote General Oglethorpe that they had chosen a minister in the person of the Reverend Samuel Quincy. (Doctor Herbert had only engaged to serve until a regular appointment could be made). The trustees suggested preparations for the site of a church, the building of the same, as well as a house for the minister. As a matter of fact, Oglethorpe had already selected a site for the church—the one now occupied by Christ Church—when the town of Savannah was planned. Prior to the erection of the first building, the General's tent was used for worship—or the open air.

Mr. Quincy was a native of Boston; before conforming to the Church of England, he had been an Independent minister. On April 4, 1733, the trustees informed Oglethorpe that the new minister had embarked. Quincy remained in Georgia until the latter part of 1735—his appointment was revoked October 10 of that year. His health was bad, and pioneer conditions proved exceedingly difficult. A temporary structure, made of boards, was used for religious services; it would not hold more than a hundred. By July 28, 1735, Quincy had held thirty-four christenings, 156 burials, and thirty-eight marriages in Georgia. His congregations numbered about twenty regular attendants and forty or fifty casual visitors. The people excused their absence on the ground that they had no convenient place of worship. Sometimes there were five or six communicants; at Easter, there were fourteen. Quincy extended the Salzburgers a cordial reception on their arrival in March, 1734. While involved in friction, he was evidently a good and sincere man. He earned the commendation of Commissary Alexander Garden of South Carolina, John Wesley was convinced that he was "good natured, friendly, peaceful, sober, just . . . and that they have no complaint against him . . . except his absence from

them . . . which they believe was chiefly owing to his ill state of health." The Society retained his services.<sup>2</sup>

A successor to Mr. Quincy was found in the Reverend John Wesley. His family had already shown an interest in the new colonial venture. In December, 1732, the Reverend Samuel Wesley, rector of Epworth parish and the father of John and Charles, had sent a pewter chalice and paten to the colony for "present use until silver ones were had"; and the following April, he was the means of transmitting from an unknown benefactor "a silver chalice and patine for the use of the first church in Savannah."<sup>3</sup> On September 24, 1735, the Reverend Charles Wesley was appointed secretary for the Indian affairs in Georgia. Two days later, the trustees agreed that a new town be laid out, to be called Frederica. On October 10, John Wesley was appointed missionary at Savannah.<sup>4</sup>

The Wesley brothers took board at Gravesend, October 14. With them were the Reverend Benjamin Ingham, one of the Oxford Methodist group, and Charles Delamotte, the son of a London merchant. "Our end in leaving our native country was not to avoid want (God having given us plenty of temporal blessings), nor to gain the dung or dross of riches or honour; but singly this, to save our souls; to live wholly to the glory of God." Thus John Wesley inscribed in his Journal the impulse which actuated him and his companions. The two days following the departure were spent by the friends, "exhorting one another 'to shake off every weight, and to run with patience the race set before us.'" Oglethorpe, who had made a return trip to England, was on the same vessel bound for Georgia.

The four earnest young Anglicans, however, were most durably affected by their conversations with the Moravians—those deeply pious German evangelicals who were allowed to emigrate to Georgia with the approval of the bishop of London, the trustees of the colony, and General Oglethorpe. Some of the Moravians had landed in Savannah on April 8, 1735, accompanied by August Gottlieb Spangenberg. The next shipload embarked with the Wesleys and Oglethorpe. On October

<sup>2</sup> This information, drawn largely from S. P. G. and Public Record Office archives, is cited in detail in Pennington, Edgar L., "The Reverend Samuel Quincy, S. P. G. Missionary" (*Georgia Historical Quarterly*, XI, 158-165, June, 1927).

<sup>3</sup> Minutes of the Trustees for the Establishment of the Colony of Georgia.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*



17, 1735, Wesley noted in his Journal that he had begun to learn German and to converse with the members of that sect. Two days afterwards, John Wesley preached on the quarter-deck and administered the holy communion to six or seven—"a little flock. May God increase it!" The next day the two Wesleys, Ingham, and Delamotte resolved to leave off flesh and wine, and to confine themselves to vegetable food, rice, and biscuits. On October 21, the vessel—named the "Simmonds," by the way—set sail from Gravesend. The following entry appears in John Wesley's Journal for that day:—

We now began to be a little regular. Our common way of living was this: from four in the morning till five, each of us used private prayer. From five to seven we read the Bible together, carefully comparing it (that we might not lean to our own understandings) with the writings of the earliest ages. At seven we breakfasted. At eight were the public prayers. From nine to twelve I usually learned German and Mr. Delamotte Greek. My brother writ sermons, and Mr. Ingham instructed the children. At twelve we met to give an account to one another what we had done since our last meeting, and what we designed to do before our next. About one we dined. The time from dinner to four, we spent in reading to those of whom each of us had taken the charge, or in speaking to them severally as need required. At four were the evening prayers; when either the second lesson was explained (as it always was in the morning) or the children were catechised and instructed before the congregation. From five to six we again used private prayer. From six to seven I read in our cabin to two or three passengers (of whom there were about eighty English on board), and each of my brethren to a few more in theirs. At seven I joined with the Germans in their public service; while Mr. Ingham was reading between the decks, to as many as desired to hear. At eight we met again, to exhort and instruct one another. Between nine and ten we went to bed, where neither the roaring of the sea nor the motion of the ship could take away the refreshing sleep which God gave us.

While at the Downs, the little group went aboard a ship that sailed in company with them; held prayers and preached. On October 31, they sailed out of the Downs. November 16, a family of four—former Quakers—were baptised after careful instruction. The Wesleys and their two companions resolved, December 7, to leave off their suppers. On St. Thomas's day (December 21), they had fifteen communicants; on Christmas, nineteen; on January 1, fifteen. John Wesley was much impressed by the piety and calmness of the Germans on the ship, especially during a storm. John Andrews Dober, a potter, one of the Moravians, stated in his diary that Wesley "loses no opportu-

nity to be present at our song service; he spares no pains to perform the duties of his office and he likes us."<sup>5</sup>

The voyage came to an end early in February. On the third of that month (1736), the ship entered the Savannah river. At eight o'clock on the morning of February 6, John Wesley first set foot on American soil.

It was a small uninhabited island, over against Tybee. Mr. Oglethorpe led us to a rising ground, where we all kneeled down to give thanks. He then took boat for Savannah. When the rest of the people were come on shore, we called our little flock together to prayers. Several parts of the second lesson, Mark VI, were wonderfully suited to the occasion; in particular, the account of the courage and sufferings of John the Baptist; our Lord's directions to the first preachers of his Gospel, and their toiling at sea and deliverance, with those comfortable words, "It is I, be not afraid."<sup>6</sup>

The next day, Oglethorpe returned from Savannah, with the German pastor, Mr. Spangenberg. That earnest man made a searching enquiry into the state of Wesley's soul; and told him that he had found philosophies and languages vain, and had given up all for Christian service.

Wesley had looked forward to an opportunity to minister to the Indians; it is certain that such a mission was his chief attraction to Georgia. On February 14, while the ship was still anchored in the mouth of the river, the friendly chief Tomochichi and six or seven Indians, with Mary Musgrove as their interpreter, came on board the vessel. "I am glad you are come," said the chief. "When I was in England, I desired that some would speak the Great Word to me. And my nation then desired to hear it. But now we are all in confusion. Yet I am glad you are come. I will go up, and speak to the wise men of our nation; and I hope they will hear. But we would not be made Christians as the Spaniards make Christians. We would be taught before we are baptized."

To this Wesley answered: "There is but one, He that sitteth in heaven, who is able to teach a man wisdom. Though we are come so far, we know not whether He will please to teach you by us or not. If He teaches you, you will learn wisdom; but we can do nothing."

Another party of Indians appeared the following day. On the sixteenth, Oglethorpe set off for a new settlement on the

<sup>5</sup> Fries, Adelaide L., *The Moravians in Georgia*, 108.

<sup>6</sup> This quotation, as well as others which follow (readily recognisable), will be found in all the editions of *Wesley Journal*.

Altamaha river, taking with him fifty men, Mr. Ingham, Mr. Hermsdorf, and three Indians. On the nineteenth, John and Charles Wesley took boat, so as to pay their first visit in America "to the poor heathens. But neither Tomochichi nor Sinauky"—his wife—"were at home." Returning, they visited Thomas Causton, the chief magistrate at Savannah; they called on the Germans, in company with Spangenberg; and then returned to their ship. On February 21, Mary Welch, aged eleven days, "was baptised according to the custom of the first Church, and the rule of the Church of England, by immersion. The child was ill then, but recovered from that hour."

Oglethorpe returned on the twenty-fourth; and Wesley then went to Savannah, where plans were being made for his accommodation. As the Reverend Mr. Quincy was still occupying the house, Wesley took up his abode with the Germans. On Sunday, March 14, 1736, he entered upon his Savannah ministry. He preached on the Epistle for the day (I Corinthians XIII—the great chapter on charity).

In the second lesson (Luke XVIII.) was our Lord's prediction of the treatment which He Himself (and consequently His followers) was to meet with from the world, and His gracious promise to those who are content, *nudi nudum Christum sequi*; "Verily I say unto you, There is no man that hath left house, or friends, or brethren, or wife, or children, for the kingdom of God's sake, who shall not receive manifold more in this present time, and in the world to come everlasting life."

Having given notice of his design to administer the holy communion every Sunday and holy day, "according to the rules of our Church," on that first Sunday John Wesley held a celebration, with eighteen communicants. Before he had been in Savannah three weeks, Wesley had established daily morning and evening public prayer; and had formed a society which met on Wednesday, Friday, and Sunday nights for the purpose of reading and praying and singing psalms together. Mr. Delamotte began teaching a few orphan children soon after arriving in Georgia.

Mr. Ingham, who had accompanied Oglethorpe to Frederica, returned to Savannah on the thirtieth of March, and urged Wesley to go back with him.

The next day Mr. Delamotte and I began to try, whether life might not as well be sustained by one sort as by variety of food. We chose to make the experiment with bread; and were never more vigorous and healthy than while we tasted nothing else. "Blessed are the pure in heart;"

who, whether they eat or drink, or whatever they do, have no end therein but to please God. To them all things are pure. Every creature is good to them, and nothing to be rejected. But let them who know and feel that they are not thus pure, use every help and remove every hindrance, always remembering, "He that despiseth little things shall fall by little and little."

Frederica was one of the new towns which Oglethorpe was establishing, so as to protect the southern border of the colony. Several small forts were to be erected nearby. In January, 1736, a company had begun a settlement at New Inverness, on the north bank of the Altamaha. Much of the General's attention was being given to the problem of fortification and protection. On April 11, Wesley arrived at Frederica, where he preached at the new storehouse on the text, "Which of you convinceth me of sin? And if I say the truth, why do ye not believe me?" There was a large congregation, which he "endeavored to convince of unbelief, by simply proposing the conditions of salvation, as they are laid down in Scripture." He spent the next six days in Frederica, hard at work. April 20, he was back in Savannah.

O blessed place, where having but one end in view, dissembling and fraud are not; but each of us can pour out his heart without fear into his brother's bosom! Not finding as yet any door open for the pursuing our main design, we considered in what manner we might be most useful to the little flock at Savannah. And we agreed, 1. To advise the more serious among them into a sort of little society, and to meet once or twice a week, in order to reprove, instruct, and exhort one another. 2. To select out of these a smaller number for a more intimate union with each other which might be forwarded partly by our conversing singly with each, and partly by inviting them altogether to our house; and this accordingly we determined to do every Sunday in the afternoon.

In matters of practice, John Wesley was uncompromising. He firmly believed in baptism by immersion. On May 5, he was asked to baptise a child of Mr. Parker, the second bailiff of Savannah. The mother told him that neither her husband nor herself would consent to its being dipped. Wesley answered: "If you certify that your child is weak, it will suffice (the rubric says) to pour water upon it." The mother replied: "Nay, the child is not weak; but I am resolved it shall not be dipped." "This argument I could not confute," said Wesley; "so I went home; and the child was baptised by another person."

On May 9, he began reading prayers in the court-house. On the 10, he started visiting his parishioners from house to

house, during the hours when they were not at work. A service was held at Skidaway, a few miles out of town, on the sixteenth. The latter part of the month, Wesley and Delamotte made a trip to Frederica, staying there for more than thirty days. During their visit, Wesley read the commendatory prayers over a dying woman, wrote a will for a man, and arranged for a small society which would hold meetings similar to the ones held in Savannah; he also reproved an officer of a man-of-war for swearing. The officer was grateful for the rebuke, and "gave (him) many thanks." Frederica was not without its evils; and Wesley felt that "some of the hearers were profited, and the rest deeply offended" by his mission there. The following note appears in his *Journal* (June 22nd):

Observing much coldness in Mr. ....'s behaviour, I asked him the reason of it. He answered, "I like nothing you do. All your sermons are satires upon particular persons, therefore I will never hear you more; and all the people are of my mind, for we won't hear ourselves abused. Besides, they say, they are Protestants. But as for you, they cannot tell what religion you are of. They never heard of such a religion before . . . And then your private behaviour. All the quarrels that have been here since you came have been long of you. Indeed there is neither man nor woman in the town, who minds a word you say."

Wesley did not seem content to remain in Savannah. He wished to minister to the Indians; but Oglethorpe felt that he should stay in the town. Notwithstanding his disappointment, he was a faithful and industrious pastor; and he has left some touching stories of his ministrations to the sick and dying.

His brother, Charles, who had arrived at the same time, was put in charge of Frederica, while waiting, as he expressed it, for an opportunity of preaching to the Indians. "I was in the meantime secretary to Mr. Oglethorpe, and also Secretary of Indian Affairs," he wrote. "The hardships of lying upon the ground &c. soon threw me into a Fever and Dysentery, which forced me in half a year to return to England." While in America, Charles encountered many difficulties. His troubles seemed to arise from the slanders of two brawling women, who had lost their virtue in the old country and who played upon the young clergyman's sympathies by pretending repentance. General Oglethorpe distrusted them; but the Wesley brothers

7 Letter of Charles Wesley to Dr. Thomas B. Chandler, in the Facsimiles of Church Documents.



persuaded him to receive them among the emigrants. Plans were soon laid to undermine Charles Wesley's hold upon Oglethorpe, as the women resented his constant reproof. On the evening of his second day at Frederica, Charles received his first harsh word from the General. Before he had been in the settlement six days, he wrote: "I would not spend six days more in the same manner for all Georgia." People treated him indecently; yet he could not guess the cause or even the identity of his accusers. He was stripped to the barest necessities, and forced to sleep on the ground.

I could not be more trampled upon were I a fallen minister of state. My few well-wishers are afraid to speak to me; the servant that used to wash my linen sent it back unwashed.

Some asked that he "would not take it ill if they seemed not to know (him) when (they) met." After awhile, Oglethorpe relented to the extent of having an interview with him. There were mutual explanations without crimination. In May, Charles went to Savannah on official business as secretary of Indian Affairs. Having countersigned all the licenses of the traders, he sent his resignation to Oglethorpe, stating that his duties conflicted with his clerical functions. He was persuaded to continue a little longer; and in July, 1736, he was commissioned to England as the bearer of certain despatches to the trustees of the colony. On August 16, he sailed from Charleston. Compelled to put in at Boston on account of the weather, he was well received; there he remained three weeks. His office did not expire till April 1738; but he never made a second trip to Georgia.

Charles Delamotte remained with John Wesley in Savannah. There he kept a school and taught some thirty or forty children to read, write, and cast accounts. Before public worship on the afternoon of the Lord's Day, he would catechise the lower class and try to implant in the minds of the youth some of the things which the clergyman had brought out in his sermon. On Sunday mornings, he instructed the larger children. He returned to England after a short stay, much lamented by the people.

The Reverend Mr. Ingham was assigned to Frederica; and there he went in company with Oglethorpe. Perhaps more prudent than Charles Wesley, he likewise found his experiences unpleasant. He entertained very strict ideas of Sunday observ-

ance, and he was distressed at the habitual disregard of the Lord's Day. "My chief business," he said, "was daily to visit the people, to take care of those that were sick, and to supply them with the best things we had. For a few days at the first, I had everybody's good word; but when they found I watched narrowly over them, and reprov'd them sharply for their faults, immediately the scene changed. Instead of blessing came cursing, and my love and kindness were repaid with hatred and ill will."<sup>8</sup> Ingham spent several months with the upper Creek Indians, making a vocabulary of their language and composing a grammar.

All this time John Wesley was indefatigable, not only in his ministrations but also in his studies. He was preaching to the Germans in their own tongue by the fall of 1736. He was facing all the privations and difficulties of his arduous field, enduring many hard trips, knowing the experience of being lost in the woods, and taking long walks through the drenching rain. In a letter written September 11, 1736, he expressed his sympathy for the Chickasaw Indians—"that Despised & almost unheard of Nation"—and feelingly described the Chickasaws as "not only Humble and Teachable (Qualities Scarce to be found among any Other of the Indian Nations) but have So firm a Reliance on Providence & So Settled a Habit of looking up to a Superior Being in all the Occurences of Life, that they appear the most likely of all the Americans, to receive and rejoice in the Glorious Gospel of Christ."

What will become of This Poor People, a few of whom now see the Light and bless God for it, when I am Called from Among them. I know not. Nor indeed what will become of them while I am here; for the Work is too weighty for me. A Parish of above Two Hundred Miles in length laughs at the Labour of One Man. Savannah alone would give Constant Employment for five or Six to Instruct, rebuke and exhort, as Need requires. Neither durst I advise any Single person to take Charge of Frederica; or indeed, to Exercise his Ministry there at all, Unless he was an experienced Soldier of Jesus Christ, that could rejoice in Reproaches, Persecutions, Distresses for Christs Sake. . . . My Hearts Desire for this Place is, Not that it may be a Famous or a Rich, but that it may be a Religious Colony.<sup>9</sup>

When Oglethorpe sailed for England, the last of November, he left John Wesley, Ingham, and Delamotte behind at Savannah; but, as Wesley noted in his *Journal*, "with less

<sup>8</sup> Fries, Adelaide L., *The Moravians in Georgia*, 128.

<sup>9</sup> *Georgia Colonial Records*, XXI, 220-221.

prospect of preaching to the Indians than we had the first day we set foot in America."

Whenever I mentioned it, it was immediately replied, "You cannot leave Savannah without a Minister." To this indeed my plain answer was, "I know not that I am under any obligation to the contrary. I never promised to stay here one month. I openly declared both before, at, and ever since my coming hither, that I neither would nor could take charge of the English any longer than till I could go among the Indians." If it was said, "But did not the Trustees of Georgia appoint you to be Minister of Savannah?" I replied, "They did; but it was not done by my solicitation; it was done without either my desire or knowledge. Therefore I cannot conceive the appointment to lay me under any obligation of continuing there any longer than till a door is opened to the heathens; and this I expressly declared at the time I consented to accept of that appointment."

In spite of his inability to carry out his cherished designs, Wesley never neglected his more immediate duties.

But though I had no other obligation not to leave Savannah now, yet that of love I could not break through; I could not resist the importunate request of the more serious parishioners, "to watch over their souls yet a little longer, till someone came who might supply my place." And this I the more willingly did, because the time was not come to preach the Gospel of peace to the heathens; all their nations being in a ferment.

Thus Wesley describes one of his experiences:

Mr. Delamotte and I, with a guide, set out to walk to the Cowpen. When we had walked two or three hours, our guide told us plainly, "he did not know where we were." However, believing it could not be far off, we thought it best to go on. In an hour or two we came to a cypress swamp, which lay directly across our way; there was not time to walk back to Savannah before night; so we walked through it, the water being about breast high. By that time we had gone a mile beyond it, we were out of all path; and it being now past sunset, we sat down intending to make a fire, and to stay there till morning; but finding our tinder wet, we were at a stand. I advised to walk on still; but my companions being faint and weary, were for lying down, which we accordingly did about six o'clock; the ground was as wet as our clothes, which (it being a sharp frost) were soon froze together; however I slept till six in the morning. There fell a heavy dew in the night, which covered us over as white as snow. Within an hour after sunrise, we came to a plantation, and in the evening, without any hurt to Savannah.

On January 2, 1737, John Wesley visited Darien—that name had been given to the settlement of the Scotch Highlanders on the Altamaha. Delamotte was with him; and the two stayed a day among "a sober, industrious, friendly, hospitable people." Thence they proceeded southward to Frederica, where they found the inhabitants "cold and heartless." Wesley re-

marked that there was found "not one who retained his first love." After a visit of three weeks, they returned to Savannah. There nearly every evening was given to visitors, who came to sing, pray, and discuss religion. Wesley had already begun the study of Spanish, as he wished to converse with some of the Jews who were settling in the colony. He declared that some of that faith seemed "nearer the mind that was in Christ than many of those who call Him Lord." Always interested in sobriety and morality, Wesley took occasion to write (March 4, 1737) commending Thomas Causton for his efforts to repress vice and immorality and to promote the glory of God by establishing peace and mutual good will among men.<sup>10</sup>

Wesley had already conceived an affection for Causton's niece, Sophia Hopkey; and that love-affair is perhaps the subject of more popular interest than any single episode in the clergyman's life. When all is said, however, we simply have an example of a sincere and earnest man, who felt a keen and bitter disappointment at his rejection by one whom he had loved and who showed his chagrin in a way which redounded to his embarrassment but in no sense to his dishonor. All efforts to besmirch the character of Wesley in this affair have proved abortive. On March 12, 1737, Miss Hopkey was married to one William Williamson. For some time Wesley had shown his fondness for her, and it is believed that he had secured her promise never to marry another; but he had evidently never asked for her hand. When it was known that her marriage was intended, Wesley went to Causton's house and revealed his desire of marrying Miss Hopkey "with Expressions of much Grief & in Tears. . . . After the Marriage he appear'd inconsolable; sometimes wanting to see her, at other times promis'd he would never see her." He always avowed his utmost love for her.<sup>11</sup>

Wesley went about his work. For awhile he took no public step which betrayed his chagrin, unless his trip to Charles Town, South Carolina, in April was prompted by the marriage. The wedding had been performed in South Carolina; and Wesley presented a formal complaint to Commissary Alexander Garden regarding someone who had married several of his

<sup>10</sup> *Georgia Colonial Records*, XXI, 370.

<sup>11</sup> Letter of Thomas Causton to the Georgia Trustees (*Georgia Colonial Records*, XXII, Part I, 204.)

parishioners without banns or license. But he was not the man who spends his time in self-pity when there are duties to be performed and Wesley had many tasks demanding attention. For instance, he found an inclination to Deism among some of the Savannah inhabitants; that caused him much distress. He was busy preparing his young people for the sacrament. On May twenty-ninth, (Whitsunday) he wrote that "four of our scholars, after having been instructed daily for several weeks, were . . . admitted to the Lord's able."

At length, on July 3, he mentioned to Mrs. Williamson "something which (he) thought reprobable in her behaviour. At this she appeared extremely angry; said, 'She did not expect such usage from me;' and at the turn of the street . . . went abruptly away." The next day, Mrs. Causton endeavoured to excuse her niece, and asked that Wesley express in writing what he disliked. The clergyman did so. But first he sent Mr. Causton a letter avowing his friendship. "Don't condemn me for doing, in the execution of my office, what I think it my duty to do."

Causton replied by a personal visit (July 6); he was accompanied by the bailiff and recorder. "Sir," asked Wesley, "what if I should think it the duty of my office to repel one of your family from the Holy Communion?" "If you repel me or my wife, I shall require legal reason," was the answer. "But I shall trouble myself about none else. Let them look to themselves."

Shortly afterwards, Wesley and his old friend Spangenberg went to see the Salzburger colony, New Ebenezer. They were favourably impressed. On August 7, back in Savannah, Wesley repelled Mrs. Williamson from the communion. The following day, a warrant was issued against him, on complaint of Williamson and Sophia his wife, "for defaming the said Sophia and refusing to administer to her the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, in a public congregation, without cause; by which the said William Williamson is damaged 1000 pounds sterling." Wesley was carried before the bailiff and recorder; but since he regarded "the giving or refusing the Lord's Supper . . . a matter purely ecclesiastical," he could not acknowledge their power to interrogate him upon the subject. The bailiff informed him that he must appear at the next court held for Savannah. When Williamson requested that he give bail for



his appearance, the bailiff replied, "Sir, Mr. Wesley's word is sufficient."

Causton became active in the matter. August 10, he demanded an explanation, and showed his temper. Wesley, who had protested that the case should be laid before the trustees, declared his willingness to submit it to them. To Mrs. Williamson herself he wrote as follows:

So many as intend to be partakers of the Holy Communion shall signify their names to the Curate at least some time the day before. This you did not do. And if any of these have done any wrong to his neighbours by word or deed, so that the congregation be thereby offended, the Curate shall advertise him, that in any wise he presume not to come to the Lord's table until he hath openly declared himself to have truly repented.

If you offer yourself at the Lord's table on Sunday, I will advertise you (as I have done more than once) wherein you have done wrong; and when you have openly declared yourself to have truly repented, I will administer to you the mysteries of God.

Causton began to spread the word that Wesley had repelled his niece through revenge, "because he had made proposals of marriage to her, which she rejected." Mrs. Williamson signed an affidavit that Wesley had proposed marriage many times and been refused. When Wesley asked for a copy of the affidavit, Causton said, "You may have one from any of the newspapers in America."

The grand jury met on August 22. There were forty-four—"one a Frenchman who did not understand English, one a Papist, one a professed infidel, three Baptists, sixteen or seventeen dissenters." These figures appear in Wesley's *Journal*, where we are told that Causton was on hand and harrangued the body. Two presentments were returned, containing ten bills. It was charged that John Wesley had offended,

1. By speaking and writing to Mrs. Williamson against her husband's consent.
2. By repelling her from the Holy Communion.
3. By not declaring his adherence to the Church of England.
4. By dividing the morning service on Sundays.
5. By refusing to baptise Mr. Parker's child, otherwise than by dipping, except the parents would certify it was weak and not able to bear it.
6. By repelling William Gough from the Holy Communion.
7. By refusing to read the burial service over the body of Nathaniel Polhill.
8. By calling himself Ordinary of Savannah.
9. By refusing to receive William Aglionby as a godfather, only because he was not a communicant.

10. By refusing Jacob Matthews for the same reason, and baptising an Indian trader's child with only two sponsors.

From September second to September fifth, Wesley appeared for the hearing; but Williamson was out of town. Consequently there was no hearing. Twelve of the grand jurors wrote to the trustees of the colony, defending Wesley on the counts. They had refused to sign the bill.

Wesley proceeded with his ministerial duties. On September 8, he wrote some Oxford friends:

Long since I began to visit my parishioners in order from house to house; but I could not go on two days longer. The sick were increasing so fast as to require all the time I had to spare—from one to five in the afternoon. Nor is even that enough to see them all, as I would do, daily. In Frederica and all the smaller settlements here are about five hundred sheep almost without a shepherd.<sup>12</sup>

The last statement was literally true. Since Ingham's departure, Wesley was the only priest of the Church of England at work in Georgia. Despite the impending prosecution, he maintained his schedule of services. Even to the last, his program on Sundays included:

1. English prayers, 5 to 6:30 A. M.
2. Italian prayers, 9 A. M.
3. Sermon and Holy Communion for the English, 10:30 to 12:30.
4. Service for the French, 1 P. M.
5. Catechising of children, 2 P. M.
6. Third English service, 3 P. M.
7. Meeting in his own house for reading, prayer, and praise.
8. Moravian service, which he attended, 8 P. M.<sup>13</sup>

Wesley's industry and self-sacrificing zeal were not fully appreciated, we may be sure. The authors of *A True and Historical Narrative of the Colony of Georgia* (published at Charles Town in 1741) make the following comment:

And now to make our subjection the more complete, a new kind of tyranny was this summer (1737) imposed upon us; for Mr. John Wesley, who had come over and was retained by us as a clergyman of the Church of England, soon discovered that his aim was to enslave our minds, as a necessary preparative for enslaving our bodies. The attendance upon prayers, meetings and sermons inculcated by him, so frequently, and at improper hours, inconsistent with necessary labour, especially in an infant colony, tended to propagate a spirit of indolence and of hypocrisy among the most abandoned; it being much easier for such persons, by an affected show of religion, and adherence to Mr. Wesley's novelties, to be provided

<sup>12</sup> Tyerman, *Wesley*, I, 142-143.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 161.

by his procurement from the public stores, than to use that industry which true religion recommends, nor indeed could the reverend gentleman conceal the designs he was so full of, having frequently declared, that he never desired to see Georgia a rich, but a religious colony.

In the same publication it was stated that people began to look upon Wesley as a Roman Catholic, because of his opposition to dissenters and his refusing them the communion. "Persons suspected to be Roman Catholics were received and caressed by him as his first rate saints." He attempted "to establish confession, penance, mortifications, mixing wine with water in the sacrament, and suppressing in the administration of the sacrament the explanation adjoined to the words of communicating by the Church of England, to show that they mean a feeding in Christ by faith, saying no more than 'the body of Christ; the blood of Christ;' by appointing deaconesses, with sundry other innovations, which he called apostolic constitutions."<sup>14</sup>

Wesley's French services were held after he discovered a settlement of French families at Highgate near Savannah, as well as a settlement of Germans at Hampstead. This was in the middle of October, 1737. As a result, he undertook to perform services every Saturday at both places in their language. On October 29, he noted in his *Journal*:

Some of the French of Savannah were present at the prayers at Highgate. The next day I received a message from them all, That as I read prayers to the French of Highgate who were but few, they hoped I would do the same to those of Savannah, where there was a large number who did not understand English.

Sunday, October 30, he "began to do so, and now have full employment for that holy day."

Wesley again appeared in court, November 3. At that time Causton proved very abusive; and the clergyman realised that so much opposition had been stirred up against him that it would be wiser to leave. Quietly he began preparations for his departure.

By this time William Stephens, Esq., had arrived in the colony, as the representative of the trustees; and Mr. Stephens, in his *Journal of the Proceedings in Georgia, beginning October 20, 1737*, has left a record of the controversy as witnessed by

<sup>14</sup> This rare book, by Pat Tailfer and others, has been reprinted; and the excerpts quoted and referred to may be found in the *Collections of the Georgia Historical Society*, II, 208ff.

a man of high intelligence and impartial outlook, interviewed by both sides. On November 3, Mr. Stephens wrote:

I had from different Hands a long Detail of the Cause of Discord between Mr. *Causton* and the Parson, ever since Mr. *Williamson* married Miss *Hopkins*, (Niece to Mr. *Causton*) which was told me variously, as the Relators inclined; but it was carried now to that Height, as to engage great Part of the Town, which was so divided, that Mr. *Causton* and Mr. *Wesley* drew their greatest Attention, and the Partisans on both Sides did not stick to throw Plenty of Scandal against their Adversaries.

The next day, a "Great Part of my Time taken up this Day in listening to Abundance of Tales which were obtruded upon me, and told very partially (I observed) my most."<sup>15</sup>

On November 6, Mr. Stephens attended church in the forenoon, where Mr. Wesley had "what is commonly called the second Service only, and a Sermon not to be found Fault with, upon mutual Forgiveness."

But I was concerned to see so thin an Audience, which proceeded from a grown Aversion to the Preacher, since this publick Strife sprung up. Several of the *Scotch* Gentlemen having hinted to me their Desire of a Conference, I sat with three or four of them over a Cup of Tea towards Evening, for an Hour, when they told me, in the Name of all the rest, of Mr. *Wesley's* informing them lately, that Mr. *Causton* persuaded him to write to the Trustees and acquaint them, that the *Scotch* here were universally a turbulent People, who neither regarded Laws, but lived idle, and continually fomented Mischief; From whence they inferr'd, that they were never to expect common Justice; but upon my asking how long since it was, that Mr. *Causton* laid this to the Parson, I was answered, more than a Year; From whence it seem'd to me, that Mr. *Wesley*, who had kept it smothering in his Breast so long, brought it forth now maliciously at this Juncture, when he and Mr. *Causton* were fallen out, in Order to exasperate the *Scotch* against him, whom at this Time he lived in good Accord with.<sup>16</sup>

On Monday, the seventh, Stephens breakfasted with Wesley; and the Causton matter was discussed, which, said Stephens, "he put in another light than what I had it on the other Side."

I desired him to be free, assuring him that my Ears were equally open.

Stephens found that the difficulty rose from Williamson's marrying Causton's niece, "whom the Parson had a liking to for himself; and who, whilst she was unmarried, used constantly to receive the Sacrament, which is here administered weekly to some few, who frequently resort to Mr. *Wesley*, for their better Edification, in private." When the young woman mar-

<sup>15</sup> Stephens, William, *Journal of the Proceedings in Georgia* . . . , I, 9.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 10-11.

ried, she stopped going to the lectures, even when sent for; "for which Reason (or some other unknown to me) Mr. *Wesley* refused her the Sacrament at the next Communion." Wesley said that he had notified her "not to offer herself there, till she had first conferr'd with him in private."<sup>17</sup>

The following day, Mr. Stephens lunched with the magistrates, at Causton's; there he was told that Mr. Wesley had been linked with others in opposing them in executing justice. It was said that they "used to come into the Court in a menacing Manner, crying out, Liberty, calling to the People to remember they were *Englishmen*, &c. and that Mr. *Wesley* was generally the principal Speaker, to harangue the People, though he had no Sort of Business, or any Call there." Mr. Stephens was convinced that the town stood divided on the controversy.<sup>18</sup>

Sunday, November 13, Mr. Wesley preached on the text: "Is it lawful to give tribute unto Caesar or not?" He took occasion to speak on the duties of magistrates and of the obedience due them from the people; but, as Mr. Stephens noted, stated that it was "nevertheless consistent with Christian Liberty for People to insist on their Rights, when they found themselves oppressed by inferior Magistrates exercising a discretionary Authority, which exceeded their Commission." The congregation was very thin; "the Magistrates and many of the principal Inhabitants of late, had wholly absented themselves from Church."<sup>19</sup>

A week later, Mr. Wesley preached on regulating one's passions. "In treating of which," said Mr. Stephens, "he shewed himself a good Casuist (as I thought) but such a metaphysical Discourse, would have been better adapted, in my Apprehension, to a learned Audience, than such a poor, thin Congregation of People, who rather stood in need of plain Doctrine."<sup>20</sup>

The following Wednesday, Mr. Stephens witnessed a conversation between Causton and the clergyman. "When they met, some Marks of Resentment were easily discoverable from their words, . . . recriminating each other; wherein I really thought Mr. *Causton* most vehement. . . . What I thought most worth my observing therefore, was that though the Parson

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 12.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 15.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 19-20.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 31.



appeared more temperate in the Debate, yet he shewed a greater Aversion to a Coalition than the other; For Mr. *Causton* very readily told him (after the first Heat was over) that to shew his Disposition to an Accommodation, he should find him come to Church again, and willing to pass over a good many Things. . . . But no such Advances were made . . . by Mr. *Wesley*." Still they parted with mutual civilities.<sup>21</sup>

On November 24, Wesley publicly advertised that he intended returning to England. Two days later, Mr. Williamson published the warning that he had a cause of £1000 against the minister, "and therefore if anyone should aid and assist Mr. *Wesley* in going out of this Province, he would prosecute such Person with the utmost Rigour."<sup>22</sup>

On Sunday, November 27, Wesley preached to his congregation on Acts 20:26-27: "Wherefore I take you to record this day, that I am pure from the blood of all men. For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God." The verses were taken from St. Paul's farewell address to the Ephesian elders; and Wesley meant this sermon as his valedictory. He was ready to escape. On Friday, he proposed setting out for Carolina; but the magistrates warned him that he must wait pending the accusations. In vain, the poor parson protested that he had already appeared at six or seven courts to make answer; he was not allowed to depart. A bond of fifty pounds was demanded. Wesley, however, felt secure in the justice of his cause. "I will give neither any bond, nor any bail at all," he declared. "You know your business and I know mine." An order was published, warning the sentinels to prevent his going. None the less, Wesley succeeded in making his departure. Thus he recounts his feelings:

Being now only a prisoner at large, in a place where I knew, by experience, every day would give fresh opportunity to procure evidence of words I never said and actions I never did, I saw clearly the hour was come for leaving this place; and as soon as evening prayers were over, about eight o'clock, the tide by then serving, I shook off the dust of my feet and left Georgia, after having preached the gospel there (not as I ought, but as I was able), one year and nearly nine months.

After encountering several difficulties, he arrived in Charleston, whence he embarked December 22. He had gone

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 36-37.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 40.

thwarted in his object, he had addressed himself to the task before him conscientiously and industriously. Restless of disposition, he felt the restraints imposed upon him; uncompromising in his standards and ideals, he was continually upset by the to Georgia with the expectation of converting the native Indians; manners and practices of a frontier community. While his ministry in America must have been a disappointment, he might console himself with the reflection that he would have accomplished more had he not encountered misunderstanding and determined opposition.

Critical appraisals of Wesley are legion; but we shall confine ourselves to the statement of those who knew him best. The Reverend Alexander Garden, of Charles Town, who saw Wesley before he finally set sail, and who had watched his ministry in Georgia, wrote the bishop of London, December 22, 1737, that he was surprised at the complaints which had been made against the clergyman.

No one could be more approved, better liked, or better reported of, by all the people of Georgia . . . till lately, that he presumed to repell the chief Magistrate's niece from the holy communion which has brought down such a storm of resentment upon him . . . The chief Magistrate is now his enemy, & so of course he is quite naught, a setter forth of strange doctrines, a Jesuite, a spiritual tyrant, a mover of sedition, &c.

Though Wesley may have been imprudent, said Mr. Garden, yet he was innocent of anything criminal in fact or intention. "This Gentleman has met with full as hard usage as did his Predecessor Mr. Quincy, and it will be Pitty if any more Clergymen be sent thither, till your Lordship's Jurisdiction be first regularly extended to that Colony that they may not be obliged to cross the Seas on every complaint made against them."<sup>23</sup>

On December 20, while the matter was fresh on his mind, William Stephens reported the affair to the trustees of the colony. He told of the breach of friendship between Mr. Wesley and Mr. Causton, which caused the former to leave the province. He said that Mr. Causton was apprehensive lest Mr. Wesley lay his case before the trustees first, so as to prepossess their opinions. Therefore, Mr. Stephens was desirous of stating what he had collected "from the most unprejudiced persons."

'Tis universally known, that the difference betwixt Mr. Wesley and

<sup>23</sup> Fulham MSS (Hawks Transcript).

Mr. Causton arose this Summer last past, & first broke out, upon Mrs. Sophia Hopkins (Neice to Mr. Causton) her marriage with one Mr. Williamson, a young man bred partly as a Clerk under uncle Mr. Jos Taylor of Bridewell, & sent over hither in the Summer 1736: whom Mr. Causton observing to have some good Qualifications, he employd him in writing & transacting particular Business; not publickly as a Clerk in the Stores, but as a Domestick, whom possibly he might have a confidence in, more than the ordinary Writers. In which way I left him, when I returned for England the latter end of the last year: and from thence ensued this conjunction; which proved a Disappointment to Mr. Wesley, who had an Intention of marrying her himself. It is to be observed here, that Mr. Wesley, who constantly administered the Sacrament at the Church weekly on Sundays, & generally on most Saints days in the year, to such few as could be wrought on to communicate so frequently, had at times set apart for that purpose in the Evening, some pious Women who resorted in his house for Exhortation, and their better Edification; among whom Miss Hopkins usually was one: but after her marriage, neglecting so strict a course of life, Mr. Wesley wrote to her, admonishing her of her relapse from Duty, & perswading her to return to her former practice of coming to those private meetings. This her husband would not allow, but absolutely forbad her assembling in that manner: and soon after, upon her refusing so to do, (for what other reason I could not yet learn) when She came to the next Communion, Mr. Wesley refused her the Sacrament: whereat her Husband enraged brought his Action the next Court against Mr. Wesley for great Damages: to which Mr. Wesley pleaded that twas not cognizable, only before an Ecclesiastical Court. Afterwards upon some Affidavit made & a Court holden, a very full Grand Jury was summond, consisting of 44 of the Principal Inhabitants, without Distinction of persons, as appeared plainly by the Sequel; for after a Charge given them to enquire into all offences, & this Affair of Mr. Wesleys among the rest; they not only made a Presentment against *him*, but also drew up a long Representation of Grievances (as they judged them) wherein they were as free with Mr. Causton as any one. All which I understand was sent by them to be laid before your Honours; and I presume it is: wherefore it best becomes me to say no more on that head, especially being of matters past before I came; & for that reason can assert nothing but as tis reported.

And now Open Defiance seemed to be given out by Mr. Wesley on one part, & the Magistrates on t'other, most of the Malecontents acceding to Mr. Wesley; & many others (I must say of the best Note & distinction) strenuously adhering to the Magistrates; resolving at all adventures to support them in the exercise of their Authority for the preservation of the whole, notwithstanding any personal Picque which possibly might exist against either of 'em.

In this miserably divided State did I find the Town on my arrival: and how great soever Mr. Wesleys Resentment was against Mr. Caustons Family, I was really sorry to see it shewn in abetting an angry Sett of people, against the Civil Magistrates, whom they appeared determined to overthrow (if possible) at any rate: and the great Resort of those Folks to Mr. Wesleys House for advice, as well as his frequent appearing in

Court, & openly espousing an opposition to the proceedings of it (tho' it no way concerned himself) plainly shewd him the Head of that Party.

Mr. Stephens described the local party differences, which were accentuated by the Wesley affair and the quarrel between William Bradley and Mr. Causton. He spoke of Wesley's escape with disapproval. Wesley had not only disregarded the court but had gone away with men of low standing in the community, "for there could scarce be found men more obnoxious." Thus he had forfeited whatever claim he may have had on his sympathy.

As I was always ready & willing, in conversation or otherwise, to make allowances for Mr. Wesleys Failings or Mistakes in Policy, & (out of respect to his Function) carefull not to run hastily into an entire Belief of all that I heard laid to his charge; I was now asked by divers, in a sneering way, what my Sentiments were of him, which indeed puzzled me. *Noscitur ex Sociis*—"He is known by his companions"—was the common By-word; & all I had to say was, that he must stand or fall by himself, when his cause came before the Trustees.<sup>24</sup>

More than six months later, Mr. Stephens noted in his *Journal* that he had examined Mr. Wesley's register. "Instead of finding it contain an Account of the Births and Burials, &c. I was surprised to see it filled with the Names of the Communicants at the Sacrament, where their Number and Day of receiving was carefully preserved; which I took Notice was generally the same Number and Persons; but what use Mr. Wesley purposed to Make of it, I cannot pretend to judge, neither could I think it worth my copying."<sup>25</sup>

When the Reverend George Whitefield arrived in Savannah, he was much impressed with the fruit of Wesley's labours. "The good which Mr. John Wesley has done in America, under God's direction, is inexpressible. His name is very precious among the people; and he has laid a foundation that I hope neither man nor devils will ever be able to shake."<sup>26</sup>

But what did Wesley himself think of his stay in Georgia? Fortunately we have the evidence of his own pen, the calm appraisal of his more reflective mood.

Many reasons I have to bless God for my having been carried to America, contrary to all my preceding resolutions. Hereby, I trust, He hath in some measure "humbled me and proved me, and shown me what

<sup>24</sup> Georgia Colonial Records, XXII, Part 1, 32-41.

<sup>25</sup> Stephens, William, *Journal of the Proceedings in Georgia* . . . , I, 234-235.

<sup>26</sup> Tyerman, *Whitefield*, I, 135-136.

was in my heart." Hereby God has given me to know many of His servants, particularly those of the Church of Herrnhuth. Hereby, my passage is open to the writings of holy men, in the German, Spanish, and Italian tongues. All in Georgia have heard the word of God, and some have believed and begun to run well. A few steps have been taken towards publishing the glad tidings both to the African and American heathens. Many children have learned how they ought to serve God, and to be useful to their neighbour. And those whom it most concerns have an opportunity of knowing the state of their infant colony, and laying a firmer foundation of peace and happiness to many generation.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>27</sup> Tyerman, *Wesley*, I, 170.



## THE SCOTTISH EFFORT TO PRESBYTERIANIZE THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND DURING THE EARLY MONTHS OF THE LONG PARLIAMENT

WINTHROP S. HUDSON  
*Chicago, Ill.*

The Reformation in Scotland, as Professor John T. McNeill has shown, was never a purely nationalistic movement.<sup>1</sup> John Knox, as well as Sir David Lyndsay, viewed the Scottish church as a part of the universal "kirk," and directed their efforts toward securing a closer uniformity with the English church and with the Reformed churches on the Continent. But it must be admitted that, until 1638, the principal drive for unity between the English and Scottish churches came from the southern kingdom.<sup>2</sup> In 1638, however, with the restoration of Presbyterianism in Scotland, the process was reversed and the Scots became vigorous in their effort to presbyterianize the Church of England.

The story of the *Solemn League and Covenant* and of the Westminster Assembly is well known, and the Scottish attempt thereby to install presbyteries in England is accepted generally without question. But the story of the earlier Scottish endeavor during the first few months of the Long Parliament has long been forgotten and ignored.<sup>3</sup> It is the surprising story of the leaders of the English House of Commons working in close collaboration and co-operation with the representatives

1 John T. McNeill, *Unitive Protestantism* (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1930), 78f.

2 This generalization must be qualified to some extent as is shown in Gordon Donaldson, "The Relations between the English and Scottish Presbyterian Movements to 1604" (London University dissertation [1938]). Noted by M. M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism* (Chicago, 1939), 222, 285-6, 298.

3 This matter has been brought to light by James D. Ogilvie, "Church Union in 1641," *Records of the Scottish Church History Society* I (1926), 143ff., who briefly explores two aspects of the problem. He describes the publishing activity of the Scots in London, and relates the incident of February 24, 1641. For a criticism of his interpretation of the significance of this event see note 88. In Joseph Minton Batten, "Life of Alexander Henderson," *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society*, IX (1917-18), 230f, two or three paragraphs are devoted to the Scottish activity in England, but his citations are often untrustworthy and misleading.

of a nation in arms against the duly constituted head of the English government, and more amazing still is the fact that they almost succeeded in their endeavor.

## I

For many years the Stuarts had been attempting to anglicize the Scottish church. Bishops had been installed and other innovations had been introduced. These changes, although not relished and meeting with much protest, at least had been accepted. But the revocation of all grants and alienations to the prejudice of the crown since the time of Mary's accession, and the imposition of the so-called *Laud's Liturgy*, aroused the country. Riots broke out in Edinburgh and it immediately became obvious that Charles had gone too far. With the patience of the Scots at an end, the Covenant was adopted on February 28, 1638, and in November the General Assembly, meeting at Glasgow, placed the Church of Scotland once more upon a Presbyterian footing.

The Scots, however, were not to have their way quite so easily, and it was not until they had defeated the English army in the first Bishop's War that the acts of the Glasgow Assembly found recognition in the Pacification of Berwick, which was signed June 18, 1639. This proved to be little more than "a scrap of paper," for when the Scottish parliament met, Charles, by subterfuge, refused to carry out what seemed to be the obvious intent of the treaty. And not only this, but Loudoun and Dunfermline who were sent to London to enter a protest against this action, were imprisoned in the Tower for treason.

Once more, on August 21, 1640, a Scottish army crossed the Tweed and set foot on English soil. On the twenty-eighth they defeated a section of the English army and by the thirtieth they had entered Newcastle. Charles hurriedly summoned the Great Council of the Peers to meet at York; but with little money and with not more than half-hearted support, he was in no position to fight, and so a conference was arranged at Ripon to effect a settlement. Here the Commissioners for the two parties carried on negotiations for some time,<sup>4</sup> but finally, early in November, with little progress having been made, the nego-

<sup>4</sup> For these proceedings see Sir John Borough, *Notes of the treaty carried on at Ripon between King Charles I and the Covenanters of Scotland*, . . . edited by John Bruce (London, The Camden Society, 1869).

tiations were transferred to London where the Long Parliament had already met on November 3.

The goal of the Scottish Commissioners<sup>5</sup> was simple—to secure the rights of the Scottish Parliament and to safeguard the Church of Scotland against innovations. For immediate purposes it was necessary to find some means for maintaining the army on English soil so that it might be used as a constant threat in the negotiations. At Ripon, in regard to this, a temporary arrangement had been made whereby the English were to pay eight hundred and fifty pounds *per diem* for the maintenance of the Scottish army. For the establishment of a permanent peace, however, and for the achievement of their general objective, the Scots presented a variety of demands. The two major items among these, in the eyes of the Scots, were the bringing to trial of the “Incendiaries” and the “reformation” of the Church of England by the “godly.”<sup>6</sup> Since the Scots never wavered in their loyalty to the king<sup>7</sup> their opposition was directed necessarily to the influence of such evil advisers, the “Incendiaries,” as Strafford, Laud, and Traquair. Also, since most of the trouble between the two kingdoms had been over religion and the effort of the court party to secure uniformity on an episcopal basis, the Scots now, as the only basis for a lasting peace, were to seek unity on a Presbyterian basis.<sup>8</sup>

5 The Scottish Commissioners were John Campbell, Earl of Loudoun; Charles Seton, Earl of Dunfermline; John Leslie, Earl of Rothes; Sir Patrick Hepburn, Baron of Waughton; Sir William Douglas, Baron of Cavers and sheriff of Teviotdale; William Drummond, Baron of Richardtown; Alexander Wedderburn, town clerk of Dundee; John Smith, bailiff of Edinburgh; Hugh Kennedy, burgess of Ayr; Archibald Johnston of Warriston; and Alexander Henderson, a clergyman. John Rushworth, *Historical Collections*. . . . (London, 1721), IV, 363.

6 *Instructions for Scottish Commissioners*, reprinted in *State Papers, Domestic, 1640-41*, 244. Borough, *Notes of the treaty . . . at Ripon*, 77. *From the Commissioners of Scotland, 24 February, 1640*, reprinted in Spaulding's *Memorials* (Spaulding Club edition), ii, 9-10. See also *Ibid.*, 11.

7 Baillie writes: “The King is now very sad and pensive; yet no man has the least intention against him; if they had, the Scots, for all their quarrels, would have their heart's blood: but the farthest is the punishing of false knaves, who have too long abused the King and us all.” Robert Baillie, *Letters and Journals*, edited by David Laing (3 vols., Edinburgh, 1841-2), I, 353.

8 “We have,” wrote Baillie, “good hopes to get Bishops, Ceremonies, and all away, and that conformity which the King has ever been vexing himself and us to obtain betwixt his dominions, to obtain it now.” *Ibid.*, 278. See also Alexander Henderson, *Scots Commissioners, their desires concerning unity in religion, 1641*, reprinted in William M. Hetherington, *History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines* (New York, 1853), App. I, 330ff.

To bring the "Incendiaries" to trial, and to cast down the bishops and erect presbyteries in their stead, obviously required English support. Consequently, the change of negotiations from Ripon to London was not unwelcome among the Scots for it offered them an excellent opportunity to influence English public and parliamentary opinion. To this end three Scottish clergymen were sent along with the Commissioners as "ministers of propaganda," with specific duties assigned to each of them.<sup>9</sup> Robert Blair was sent to satisfy any objections which the Independents might have in regard to presbyteries; Robert Baillie's concern was to be with the Laudian group against whom he had written his *Self-Conviction*; while George Gillespie to devote his attention "to the crying down of English Ceremonies." Alexander Henderson, as a Commissioner, appears to have served as the director of these propaganda activities.

The winning of English support for the Scottish objectives was not as hopeless a task as might be assumed. The broadsides with which the Scots flooded England in preparation for their invasion undoubtedly had influenced public opinion and had served to justify the Scottish action in the eyes of many Englishmen.<sup>10</sup> Moreover, during the Short Parliament of the year before, the Scots derived much encouragement from the fact that the Commons had refused to vote supplies for the army which were necessary for the prosecution of the war.<sup>11</sup> Furthermore, although Archibald Johnston had failed in his endeavor to secure, through Thomas Savile, the active assistance of a group of English peers for the Scottish invasion, the

9 "At our Presbytery, after sermon, both our noblemen and ministers in one voice thought meet, that not only Mr. A. Henderson, but also Mr. R. Blair, Mr. George Gillespie, and I, should all three, for diverse ends, go to London: Mr. Robert Blair, to satisfy the minds of many in England, who loves the way of New England better than that of Presbyteries used in our Church: I, for the convincing of that prevalent faction against which I have written: Mr. Gillespie, for the crying down of English Ceremonies, for which he has written." Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 269.

10 See Aldis, *List of Books printed in Scotland*, numbers 968, 970, 971, 972, and 979. Two of these are reprinted in the Appendix of Borough, *Notes of the treaty . . . at Ripon*.

11 Although many secondary writers affirm that the leaders of the House of Commons during the Short Parliament carried on secret negotiations with the Scots, the evidence merely indicates that they were so accused by their adversaries. *State Papers, Domestic, 1640*, 140-1, 144-5, 153-4. Nevertheless, in the light of similar co-operation during the Long Parliament, the accusation probably had some basis in fact.

lords in question did agree to co-operate by making a concerted demand for the calling of parliament.<sup>12</sup> These negotiations would suggest that similar negotiations had been undertaken with other groups. It is not unreasonable to suppose that the Scots had made contact with various leaders in the Puritan movement, both clerical and lay, and had been reassured concerning the state of public sentiment.<sup>13</sup>

England, as well as Scotland, was dissatisfied both politically and religiously, and offered a fertile field for cultivation by the Scots. The policies of Strafford and Laud were unpopular and met with scarcely less opposition in England than in Scotland. There was, undoubtedly, a continuation of the influence of Thomas Cartwright apparent in the latent Puritanism which now was beginning to reassert itself. Particularly among the landed gentry of the southeastern counties there was a strong Puritan movement which was becoming increasingly vigorous. Moreover, with trade depressed and taxes high, the merchants and artisans of the urban areas were restless and were becoming rebellious, and since the political and ecclesiastical policies of the court party were closely intermingled, this discontent took religious as well as political form. Added to this was the nationalistic fear of the supposed French and Catholic sympathies of the court circle, which seemed to find justification in the "high-church" policies of Laud. It is small wonder, then, that the parliament which met November 3, 1640, had a strong Puritan cast. Even before the Scottish Commissioners arrived in London, proceedings had been begun against the Lieutenant and sentiment had been expressed in parliament for a change in the religious situation.

A few days after the Commissioners' arrival in the English capital, Baillie wrote: "We were extremely welcome here."<sup>14</sup> And welcome they were, for the leaders of the Puritan majority in the House of Commons looked upon the Scots as God-sent

12 John Oldmixon, *History of England during the reigns of the Royal "House of art"* (London, 1730), 141. See also S. R. Gardiner, *History of England, from the Accession of James I, to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1607-1642* (London, 1891) IX, 178-180, 198-199. The Scots had accepted Savile's forged letter as authentic and had expected the peers to come to their assistance with men and money. Baillie, *Letters*, I, 257, 261.

13 Late in 1639, Robert Baillie had despatched Alexander Cunningham to sound out public sentiment in England and to discover what support they might expect. Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 225-228.

14 *Ibid.*, I, 273.



allies rather than enemies.<sup>15</sup> When the king in his opening speech referred to them as "rebels," he met with the instant indignation of the House, and on November 10, three days before the Scots arrived, Sir William Widdrington incurred equal displeasure by the use of the same offensive term.<sup>16</sup> By November 17, Stephen Marshall and Cornelius Burges, in their Fast Day sermons before the Commons, were suggesting the advisability of a "covenant," whereupon Baillie, overjoyed, wrote home: "Episcopacy itself is beginning to be cried down, and a Covenant cried up, and the Liturgy to be scorned."<sup>17</sup>

Not only were the leaders of the English popular party and the Scots united by their common opposition to the political and religious policies of the court faction, but the English parliament which met at this time owed its very life to the Scots. Charles had used every expedient in seeking to avoid the necessity of summoning parliament, but without money to fight the Scots and without funds to provide for the maintenance of the Scottish army while negotiations proceeded, and confronted by the demand of the Scots and the peers that parliament be called, he had finally yielded to the inevitable. But for parliament to secure its reforms and the redress of its grievances it was essential that "the lads about Newcastle sit still." As long as the Scottish army remained in the north, Charles could not defy parliament without running the risk of having the Scots march south on London. Consequently, parliament feared nothing so much as that the Scots would reach an early agreement with the king and thereupon disband their army. In such a situation, close co-operation between the Scots and parliament became inevitable. The English needed Scottish support and the Scots needed English support. It is no wonder that Baillie referred to parliament as "our sure refuge," and optimistically asserted: "Never such a parliament in England: all is to be rectified."<sup>18</sup>

15 On November 17, Dr. Burges, quoting Jeremiah, reminded the House that Israel was saved by an army from the north. *The Journal of Sir Simonds D'Ewes*, edited by Wallace Notestein (New Haven, 1923), 39n. On November 19, "One of the Burgesses of Newcastle stood up and said, that those parts rather feared mischief by the King's army than by others." *The Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds D'Ewes*, edited by J. O. Halliwell (2 vols., London, 1845), II, 253.

16 Rushworth, *op. cit.*, IV, 12, 17. D'Ewes, *Journal*, 2n, 20.

17 *Ibid.*, 39n.; Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 273.

18 *Ibid.*, I, 285, 280.

## II

The Scottish Commissioners arrived in London on November 13, and the "ministers of propaganda" immediately set to work. Baillie, in a fine bit of alliteration, defined their duties as praying, preaching, and printing.<sup>19</sup> Of their prayers we have no record, but the preaching took place in St. Antholin's Church, an old Puritan stronghold, which the English had assigned to them. Here the ministers took turns in preaching to large audiences.<sup>20</sup> We may be sure that such an excellent opportunity to foment discontent was not neglected, and it may have been for this end that the use of the church had been granted them. Although we know little of the tenor of their sermons, it may be assumed that they were not of a character to allay the religious unrest of the London populace.<sup>21</sup> As for the printing, the Scots soon had a steady stream of tracts issuing from the press.<sup>22</sup>

Baillie, however, seems to have overlooked the most im-

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 299.

<sup>20</sup> "The people throngs to our sermon . . . their crowd daily increases." *Ibid.*, I, 295.

<sup>21</sup> On one occasion, Baillie "spent much of an hour in an historic narration . . . of all that God had done for us, from the maids' commotion in the Cathedral of Edinburgh to that present day: many tears of compassion and joy did fall from the eyes of the English." *Ibid.*, I, 295. Alexander Henderson preached in Newcastle on the day of the Scots' entry, and a royalist makes this report of his sermon: "The day of their arrival at Newcastle Mr. Henderson preached, who so much forgot this text and the duty of his calling, that he fell into a strange extravagant way of applauding their success and depraving the English, making that the whole subject of his discourse." *State Papers, Domestic*, 1640-41, 29.

<sup>22</sup> By December 28, all copies of Baillie's *Self-Conviction* in London had been exhausted, a new edition had come over from Amsterdam, and he was at work on a revision and a "large supplement." Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 284. This revision, *Ladensium Autokatakrisis, the Canterburians Self-Conviction* . . . (London, 1641), was at the printers on February 22, 1641. *Ibid.*, I, 299. On January 23, Henderson's *The Unlawfulness and Danger of Limited Prelacy, or Perpetual Presidency in the Church, briefly discovered*, was put on sale. *Ibid.*, I, 292. (Thomason erroneously lists Baillie as the author.) By February 28, George Gillespie had published his *Certain Reasons tending to prove the Unlawfulness and inexpediency of all Diocesan Episcopacy (even the most moderate)*. *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, I, 149. Ready for the press by the same date were: Baillie's *The Unlawfulness and Danger of Limited Episcopacy*. Whereunto is subjoined a short reply to the Modest advertiser, and calm examiner of that Treatise . . .; Henderson's *The Governement and Order of the Church of Scotland*; Gillespie's *An assertion of the government of the Church of Scotland, in the points of ruling elders, and of the authority of presbyteries and synods*, which was in answer to Bishop Hall's *Episcopacy by Divine Right*; and Robert Blair had ready "a pertinent answer to Hall's remonstrance." Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 303, 362.

portant item among the duties of his fellow propagandists. Either "plotting" or "planning" would serve to carry out his alliteration and either term would be descriptive of much of their activity. It was a time of plot and counter-plot and conspiracy was in the air. It was only natural, in their mutual dependence upon each other, that the reform party among the English, particularly the Presbyterians, and the Scots should confer with one another for advice, counsel, assistance, and formulation of a common program of action, to achieve their ends. By December 2, an alliance had been effected between the Independents and those "who are for the Scots' discipline."<sup>23</sup> thus forming a seventeenth century parallel to our modern leftist "united fronts;" this was soon extended to include some of the moderates.

The first task,—the Scots, in consultation with the parliamentary leaders, having decided to defer any attempt at ecclesiastical reform until the incendiaries were out of the way,<sup>24</sup>—was to draw up "The Charge of the Scottish Commissioners against Canterbury and the Lieutenant of Ireland."<sup>25</sup> This task was delegated to Baillie, whose first draft was criticized by the rest of the party, by "our friends in the Lower House," and then was put in final form by Henderson, Loudoun, and Johnston.<sup>26</sup> Scarcely before the ink had time to dry on these charges, however, the carefully laid plans to defer action on changes in church government until Laud and Strafford had been dealt with went awry. The people of London had become increasingly impatient at the delay in beginning the consideration of ecclesiastical reformation and it became apparent that they could no longer be restrained from submitting their petition demanding the overthrow of episcopacy, "root and branch."<sup>27</sup> So on December 11, a large throng assembling at

23 Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 275.

24 *Ibid.*, 273-4, 275, 280.

25 Reprinted in Spaulding's *Memorials*, I, 363ff., and in Rushworth, *Historical Collections*, IV, 113ff.

26 "Our pieces against Canterbury and the Lieutenant are now ready. The first moulding of both was laid on me; when all had perused my two draughts, and our friends in the Lower House considered them, the one was given to Mr. Alexander, the other to Loudoun and Mr. Archibald to abridge and polish." Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 280. The submitting of Scottish papers to friends in parliament for criticism and suggestion before they were issued seems to have been a customary procedure. Particularly was this true of the papers submitted with the various Scottish "Demands" during the negotiations of the treaty. *Ibid.*, I, 285, 289.

27 *Ibid.*, I, 280.

Westminster, the London Petition was submitted to parliament for consideration.

With the whole question of church government thus opened, it became necessary for the reform party to confer once more in order to formulate the strategy to be followed in overthrowing the bishops. The parties to this conference, in addition to the Scots, were probably the London group headed by Alderman Pennington;<sup>28</sup> representatives of the popular party in parliament, perhaps such men as Sir Robert Harley, Sir Harry Vane the Younger, Nathaniel Fiennes, William, Lord Paget, Philip, Lord Wharton, and others;<sup>29</sup> and the Presbyterian and Independent leaders among the English clergy.<sup>30</sup>

The first problem to be faced was the question of how to

28 Evidence for collaboration between the Scots and the London group is not conclusive, but it is entirely plausible. When Alexander Cunningham was despatched by Baillie to spy out conditions in England, he was directed to enquire of "a discreet alderman of London" why they did not come to the aid of the Scots during the First Bishops' War. *Ibid.*, I, 226-7. By November 18, five days after their arrival, the Scots knew of the existence of the Root and Branch Petition and why it was being withheld. *Ibid.*, 273. On December 28, Pennington, "with his brethern and some of the town-captains, and some from the Inns of Court" came to express their appreciation to the Scots for their aid. *Ibid.*, 288. Between the Scots and the London merchants existed the possibility of an excellent "squeeze" for the achievement of their mutual objectives. The one provoked the imperative need for funds, while the other controlled the principal means by which such funds could be supplied. When Digby offered a loan of 50,000 pounds, coupled with a denunciation of Henderson's paper of February 24, Pennington immediately came to the rescue by offering a loan of 100,000 pounds. D'Ewes, *Journal*, 420-1. Also the Scots knew that the Londoners were to demand the conviction of Strafford as the prerequisite to further loans a full month before such a demand was made in parliament. Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 302. *Journals of the House of Lords*, IV, 206.

29 Harley presented the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance. D'Ewes, *Journal*, 277. Vane and Fiennes were appointed to the committee which was to consider the petitions as representatives of this group. Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 302. Both of them spoke for the plan of having parliamentary commissioners to govern the church during the interim until a more permanent government could be established. Rushworth, *op. cit.*, IV, 176, 293. John Nalson, *Impartial Collection of the Great Affairs of State . . .* (London, 1683), II, 295. Such men as Hampden, Pym, White, Moore, and Stanley were probably the other leaders of this group in the House of Commons. William, Lord Paget and Philip, Lord Wharton on one occasion, at least, served as the spokesmen for the Scots in the House of Lords and indulged in "Some hot reasoning" on their behalf. Baillie speaks of them as "our sure friends." Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 290.

30 This group would include the authors of *Smectymnus*, Stephen Marshall, Edmund Calamy, Thomas Young, Matthew Newcomen, and William Spurstowe. Cornelius Burges served as spokesman for the group before the committee of the House of Commons. Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 302-3, 308. D'Ewes, *op. cit.*, 369, 379. Also appearing before the committee in favor of the petition were Calyute Downing, of whom Baillie speaks as "my familiar friend," and a clergyman of Dorset named White. *Ibid.*, 313; Baillie, I, 286.

unite the Presbyterians and Independents behind this effort to uproot the bishops. This was solved by deciding that they should join together in the task of pulling down the present government and ceremonies of the church and keep silent on any differences they might have until this was accomplished.<sup>31</sup> Then with the bishops put down, their plan was to have parliament appoint commissioners, both lay and clerical, for every shire to govern the church in the interim before the calling of a General Assembly.<sup>32</sup> Since the greater part of the clergy was considered "very corrupt"—that is too much inclined to Anglicanism—it was feared to call a General Assembly until the ranks of the clergy had been purified.<sup>33</sup> This proposal seemed to satisfy both the Presbyterians and Independents, for the lay and clerical commissioners settled in every congregation<sup>34</sup> differed from members of a presbytery only by their parliamentary appointment,<sup>35</sup> while the Independents recognized in this temporary expedient an opportunity to consolidate their ranks and the possibility of securing control of the subsequent Na-

31 On December 2, Baillie wrote that the Independents "and the rest who are for the Scots' Discipline, do amicably conspire in one, to overthrow the Bishops and Ceremonies, hoping when these *rudera* are put away, that they shall well agree to build a new house, when the ground is well swept." *Ibid.*, I, 275. On December 28, he wrote that "there was some fear for these of the new way, who are for the Independent congregations, but after much conference, thanks be to God, we hope they will join to overthrow Episcopacy, erect Presbyterian government and Assemblies, and, in any difference they have, to be silent, upon hope either of satisfaction when we get more leisure or of toleration, on their good and peaceable behavior." *Ibid.*, I, 287. In the meantime, there had been some worry that the Separatists, by "their impertinence," might serve to weaken the party opposed to the bishops; but, said Baillie, "we trust, by God's blessing on our labor, to prevent that evil." *Ibid.*, I, 275, 282. By March 15, Baillie was writing: "All the English ministers of Holland, who are for New-England way, are now here: how strong their party will be here, it is diversely reported; they are all on good terms with us: Our only considerable difference will be about the jurisdiction of Synods and Presbyteries. As for Brownists, and Separatists of many kinds, here they dislike them well near as much as we: of these there is no considerable party . . . Our questions with them of the new way, we hope to get determined to our mutual satisfaction, if we were rid of bishops; and till then, we have agreed to speak nothing of anything wherein we differ." *Ibid.*, I, 311.

32 *Ibid.*, I, 287. Also set forth by Vane and Fiennes. Rushworth, *op. cit.*, IV, 176, 293. Nalson, *op. cit.*, II, 295.

33 "At this time a General Assembly would spoil all, the far most of their clergy being very corrupt." Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 287.

34 One must be careful to distinguish this plan from the proposal of the moderate Anglicans to appoint clerical commissioners.

35 It would have been exceedingly dangerous, and perhaps disastrous, to have had them elected by the congregations at this time, for in many parishes the Anglicans were undoubtedly in the majority.



tional Assembly and thereby the establishment of Independence.

The second problem which these strategists faced was to determine their best method by which they might reinforce the demands set forth in the London Petition. For the present, the Scots withheld their demand for uniformity in religion as the only basis for a permanent peace, since this was to be presented later as their final maneuver in the treaty negotiations. But they undoubtedly did advocate that petitions similar to the London Petition be sent up from the counties, for such documents soon began to flood parliament. Their principal reliance, however, seems to have been placed in a petition of the clergy which would buttress those of the laity, and which would tend to give the demands an air of clerical and academic respectability. By December 12, "sundry country ministers" were meeting with the Scots to draw up a remonstrance, "which *in the name of the Church*, shall shortly be presented against the bishops."<sup>36</sup> By the end of the month, this petition "was posting through the land for hands to make it stark; against it can come back it will be a fortnight, at which time a large remonstrance, by some dozen hands chosen out of the whole number, will be ready, against the Bishops corruptions in doctrine, discipline, life and all. . . . At that time the root of Episcopacy will be assaulted with the strongest blast it ever felt in England."<sup>37</sup>

In the meantime, before the petition with its signatures could be returned, a reappraisal of the political situation and of religious sentiment in parliament necessitated a change in strategy. The presentation of the London petition, on December 11, had seriously divided parliamentary opinion for the first time.<sup>38</sup> All of the members recognized the necessity for correcting the abuses of the bishops,<sup>39</sup> but, as Baillie was later to say, "their utter abolition, which is the only aim of the most godly, is the knot of the question."<sup>40</sup> Under the leadership of

36 *Ibid.*, I, 282. The italics are mine.

37 *Ibid.*, I, 286-7.

38 "There were many against, and many for the same." The Scottish Commissioners in London to the Committee in Newcastle, *Advocates Library, Edinburgh*, 33, 4, 6. Quoted by S. R. Gardiner, *The Fall of the Monarchy of Charles I, 1637-1649* (London, 1882) II, 36.

39 The speeches in parliament all begin with a recitation of abuses, but diverge in all directions after the opening paragraph or two.

40 Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 303.

Archbishop Ussher of Armagh, a large faction was advocating a reformed and limited episcopacy.<sup>41</sup> This group had sufficient strength to delay consideration of the London Petition, and it became apparent that if the more radical group was to be successful in their endeavor to abolish bishops entirely, they must devise some means for securing the support of at least a few of the moderates who were for a reformed episcopacy.<sup>42</sup> Cornelius Burges, the leader of the London clergy,<sup>43</sup> appears to have been the first to recognize the necessity for a change in strategy and seems to have been particularly insistent that such a change be made.<sup>44</sup>

Instead of the dozen or so men meeting to draw up the remonstrance as had been planned, some four score of the "well affected clergy" assembled to perform the task.<sup>45</sup> Rather than make a frontal attack on the bishops, they decided to adopt the

41 *Ibid.*, 287.

42 It is necessary to make a careful distinction between a "reformed episcopacy" and "primitive episcopacy." All factions would echo Tertullian in saying, "Whatsoever is first is true, but that which is latter is adulterous," and all would pay lip service, at least, to the concept of "primitive episcopacy." In the debate of February 9, 1641, in the House of Commons, every speaker advocated "primitive episcopacy," and yet scarcely more than two of them agreed as to the meaning of that term.

43 *Ibid.*, 302-3. A Latin sermon which he had preached before the London clergy, wherein he blamed the bishops for the growth of Arminianism and popery, caused Burges to be brought before the Court of High Commission in 1635. In September, 1640, he conveyed to Charles at York the petition of the London clergy against the "etcetera oath." *Dictionary of National Biography*, III, 301. On numerous occasions during the Long Parliament, he appears to have represented the London clergy before the House of Commons.

44 By this, Burges appears to have aroused the fear of the Scots. Baillie writes: "We did suspect him as too much Episcopal, and wished he had not been of the number; but he has such a hand among the ministry, and others, that it was not thought meet to decart him; yet, he has carried himself so bravely, that we do repent of our suspicions." Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 302-3. In 1643, Burges, anxious not to create an irreparable breach with the episcopal party, protested against the imposition of the Solemn League and Covenant. He was successful in having inserted a clause limiting the type of "prelacy" it was aimed at, which made it possible for the advocates of a reformed episcopacy to sign the Covenant, *D.N.B.*, III, 302.

45 Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 286-7. D'Ewes, *op. cit.*, 313, 314. Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England* (6 vols., Oxford, 1888), I, 271-2, doubts the authenticity of the seven or eight hundred signatures attached to the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance. It is true that the original signatures were not affixed to the final document, but Digby and Strangways, for all of their effort in that direction, were unable to uncover anyone who would disavow his subscription. Strangways spoke of thirteen or fifteen in Dorsetshire who subscribed with reservations, but Hampden forced him to confess that their names were not on the final draft, while Burges and Downing testified that their only quarrel was with the length and not with the substance of the remonstrance. D'Ewes, *op. cit.*, 313, 314.

Fabian tactics of seeking to gain their objective by a flank attack. Instead of demanding the abolition of episcopacy "root and branch," they sought, by an attack on individual points and abuses, to achieve the same end.<sup>46</sup> On any one item they thought there might be sufficient support to secure the approval of parliament, and thus, by stripping away all temporal and spiritual power of the bishops, to obtain their downfall.<sup>47</sup>

Since the original document has been lost, we must turn to the notes made by Verney in the committee which considered the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance for our knowledge of its contents.<sup>48</sup> Among other things which are challenged

46 The great majority of secondary writers give little attention to this important document, but of those who do give it some consideration, practically all consider the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance a moderate stand, not directed against episcopacy, but against its abuse. *E.g.* W. A. Shaw, *A History of the English Church* . . . (2 vols., London, 1900), I, 23-34; and Alexander Gordon, article on "Stephen Marshall," *D.N.B.*, XII, 1129. Yet this petition was fathered by such a good Presbyterian as Baillie, who spoke little of the London Petition but constantly of this petition, and who speaks of the effectiveness of the other petitions only to conclude: "And above all in that large and grave Remonstrance, some months ago presented to the Honorable Houses of Parliament from the most of the Ministers of England, who has any spark of zeal to the glory of God." Robert Baillie, *Self-Conviction*, 11 of "a large supplement." Even Alexander Gordon recognizes the large part played by that ardent Presbyterian, Stephen Marshall, in the formulation of this document, although he mistakes Marshall for a moderate Anglican of reformist tendencies. *D.N.B.*, XII, 1129. A cursory examination of *Smectymnuus* will dispell all illusions that Marshall was anything but a Presbyterian.

47 It is true that Alexander Henderson, in his *The Unlawfulness and Danger of Limited Prelacy*, written just after his arrival in London, had viewed with alarm even bishops in name only. *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, I (1926), 146-7. Yet, when confronted by the realities of the situation, he must have been willing to make a concession in regard to terminology, in order to achieve his end in substance. Upon more mature reflection, he undoubtedly discovered that he could not oppose bishops as unscriptural; he could only object to an unscriptural interpretation of that title. Baillie adopted this position as did the author of *Certain Reasons tending to prove the Unlawfulness and inexpediency of all Diocesan Episcopacy*. Baillie, *Letters*, I, 352. Baillie, *Self-Conviction*, 34-5, "A postscript for the personate Jesuit Lysimachus Nicanor." *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, I (1926), 144. The most they dared to assert was that bishops, as superior to presbyters, were both unlawful and dangerous. This is not to say that there was any less emphasis upon Presbyterianism as "the" church government of divine institution. Baillie describes this Fabian policy in these words: "To take down the roof first to come to the walls, and, if God would help, not to stay till they raised the foundation: However to go on so far as was possible; leaving, without any legal confirmation, what now they cannot win to till a better time." Baillie, *Letters*, I, 308.

48 *Verney Papers. Notes of Proceedings in the Long Parliament, Temp. Charles I* (London, Printed for the Camden Society, 1845), 4ff. The primary importance of this document is manifest by the fact that in the *Journal of the House of Commons* the committee to which all of the petitions had been referred is called the "Committee for the Ministers Remonstrance." Moreover, while

are: the divine institution of bishops,<sup>49</sup> the assumption by bishops of sole power of ordination and ecclesiastical jurisdiction,<sup>50</sup> the large size of dioceses, the claim of the bishops to be the sole pastors in all parts of the diocese, their sole power of confirmation, the necessity for the consecration of churches by bishops, and the imposition by bishops of oaths of canonical obedience. One cannot escape the feeling that the text of this document approximates very closely the scheme set forth by the authors of *Smectymnuus*.<sup>51</sup> These, men, while outlining a Presbyterian scheme as "the exact form of government," set forth in the scriptures,<sup>52</sup> were compelled to admit that bishops could not be excluded on a biblical basis. But they emphasized that "Bishops and Presbyters were Originally the same," that they were "the same in name, in Office, in Edifying the Church, in power of Ordination and Jurisdiction."<sup>53</sup> The solution they proposed was to give all "presbyters" the title of "bishop" as well.<sup>54</sup>

Although it is practically impossible today to determine—whether, during the early months of the Long Parliament, a man was a Presbyterian or an Independent,<sup>55</sup> we do know that

the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance is frequently mentioned after February 9, the London or Root and Branch Petition is given only occasional and incidental notice.

49 There is some confusion here as Verney's note reads: "Bishops not of divine institution, which they challenge." *Ibid.*, 4. The "Remonstrants" certainly would not challenge that. A subsequent entry, however, clarifies the confusion. On the following page Verney writes: "Bishops challenge themselves to be of divine right."

50 This matter of the power of sole jurisdiction and ordination seems to have been the point which separated the Presbyterians and Independents from the Anglicans, and it is here that the "Remonstrants" betray their party affiliation. They protest against "a superiority in sole ordination, and sole jurisdiction, which are not in scripture or antiquity; by virtue of a distinct order superior to a presbyter." *Ibid.*, 5. And they cite biblical texts "to prove that sole ordination and sole jurisdiction is not in bishops, but the presbyters were equal to them in all things." *Ibid.*, 8.

51 *Smectymnuus Redivivus, Being an Answer to a Book, entitled An Humble Remonstrance . . ., composed by five Learned and Orthodox Divines* (London, 1660). This document, says Baillie who should know, was written "for the most part" by Thomas Young, a Scotsman. Baillie, *Letters*, I, 366.

52 *Ibid.*, 152.

53 *Ibid.*, 17, 20.

54 *Ibid.*, 66, 67.

55 This is not true of those men who have left behind them literary evidence of their position at this time, e. g., the authors of *Smectymnuus*. Nor is it true of such men as are specifically named in contemporary documents as being either Presbyterians, or Independents, although care must be exercised here to determine that the terms are not used merely as general epithets of disapprobation. But, for the most part, since the Scots, the Presbyterians,

the two parties existed and that men of that time recognized them as such.<sup>56</sup> According to Baillie's testimony, the majority of the clergy who were responsible for the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance were Presbyterians,<sup>57</sup> and it was merely political expediency which led them to co-operate with the Independents.<sup>58</sup> For, although they were on good terms with "those of the new way" and respected them, it was only with foreboding that such a man as Baillie could look upon their scheme of church government.<sup>59</sup> Nevertheless, the two parties

the Independents and others were working in close co-operation, it is possible only to determine that a man belonged to this general grouping. Also since men's opinions were in flux at this time, the fact that one held certain convictions in 1643 is no guarantee that he held the same convictions in 1641.

56 J. H. Hexter (*American Historical Review*, xlv, 29ff) seeks to explode the idea that there were definite Presbyterian and Independent parties during the Long Parliament. While there is much truth in what he says concerning the members of parliament, his thesis does not hold when it comes to the clergy. The members of clergy, immersed in theological thinking, for the most part knew what they wanted, whether it happened to be bishops, presbyteries, or local congregations. Even in parliament some allowance must be made for personal conviction.

57 "The far greatest part are for our discipline." Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 287. This should not be accepted uncritically, for Baillie was not without bias. On the other hand, we know that Baillie did not lump all discontented groups together and call them all Presbyterians, but made a careful distinction between the moderate Anglicans, the Presbyterians, the Independents, and the Separatists. Furthermore, we know that there had been a strong Presbyterian movement in England scarcely thirty years before, whereas the growth of Independency was just beginning. Also contributing to Presbyterian strength was the prestige of the Reformed churches abroad, and in practically all the contemporary proposals for religious reform there was expressed a desire to secure a closer uniformity with those continental Protestant bodies. Lastly, a not inconsiderable factor contributing to Presbyterian strength was the prestige enjoyed by the Scots by virtue of their successful struggle against the Laudian prelates. In a short time the Scots were to become a liability, but for the moment they were an asset.

58 Even political expediency could not bring the Presbyterians to co-operate with the Separatists, although we have no record of them refusing such support. It was possible for them to take such a position because the Separatists had little strength in parliament at this time. Nevertheless, they held these sectaries in great dread and Baillie reports that the Independents "mislike them near as much as we." Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 311.

59 Baillie writes concerning the Independents: "They are all on good terms with us: Our only considerable difference will be about the jurisdiction of Synods and Presbyteries. . . . Mr. Godwin, Mr. Burroughs, Mr. Simonds . . . all of them are learned, discreet, and zealous men. . . . It were all the pities in the world that we and they should differ in anything, especially in that one, which albeit very small in speculation, yet in practice of very huge consequence: for, make every congregation an absolute and independent Church, over which Presbyteries and General Assemblies have no power of censure, but only of charitable admonition, my wit sees not how incontinent a National Church should not fall into unspeakable confusions, as I am confident that the goodness of God will never permit so gracious men to be the occasions of, let be the authors." Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 311. Further evidence of the co-operation



forgot their differences for the moment and united their forces for the struggle against episcopacy.

This strategy for winning the support of the moderate Anglicans for the immediate program of the Scots, Presbyterians, and Independents was successful. By February 28, William Twisse had become a remonstrant,<sup>60</sup> and long before this Sir Simmonds D'Ewes, an intimate friend of Archbishop Ussher,<sup>61</sup> was working in full co-operation with the more radical group.<sup>62</sup> When the question of committing the various petitions came up in the Commons on February 8 and 9, not even such ardent Episcopalians as Digby, Seldon, and Hyde dared oppose the Ministers' Petition.<sup>63</sup> To secure the committal of the other petitions, however, it was necessary to reserve the question of episcopacy for later consideration by the House. This was done without much protest on the ninth, which was probably due to the reassuring activity of the sponsors of the Ministers' Petition, who Baillie reports "all that night . . . solicited as hard as they could."<sup>64</sup>

The various petitions were referred to the Committee of Twenty-four, after the addition of six more members,<sup>65</sup> and it immediately began the consideration of the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance. The committee met in the afternoon three times a week and before it appeared some eight to six-

of the Independents with the Presbyterians is to be found in Burroughs' record of his visit with the Scots, and in the fact that Henderson wrote the preface to Burroughs' answer to the Petition for the Bishops. *Ibid.*, I, 303. Jeremiah Burroughs, *Irenicum, to the Lovers of Truth and Peace* (1646), 156.

60 Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 303.

61 "I have a most intimate and dear familiarity with the Archbishop of Armagh, whom I have promised to take lodgings by him in the Covent Garden," D'Ewes, *Autobiography*, II, 253.

62 When Digby was questioning the authenticity of the signatures to the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance, D'Ewes was able to rise immediately to his feet and explain the manner in which the remonstrance had been framed. D'Ewes, *Journal*, 310, 313-14.

63 Nathaniel Fiennes appears to have acted as the chief spokesman for the group on this occasion. The sudden attack of Rudyard, Digby, and Falkland on the London Petition seems to have caught the other party unprepared. Shaw mistakenly assumes that Fiennes offered "an alternative scheme of his own, a scheme which was subsequently adopted in the Root-and-Branch debates, and which indicates how even the Puritan mind of England at this time turned from a Presbyterian scheme of government with dread and aversion." W. A. Shaw, *op. cit.*, I, 35. It was neither a scheme of his own, nor was it subsequently adopted in the Root-and-Branch debates. It was merely the scheme for lay and clerical commissioners which the Presbyterians and Independents had proposed as an integral part of their strategy. Rushworth, *op. cit.*, IV, 176.

64 Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 302.

65 D'Ewes, *Journal*, 342, 343; Baillie, *op. cit.* I, 302.

teen of the Remonstrants. Dr. Burges served as the principal spokesman for this group and by his vigorous presentation vindicated himself in the eyes of the Scots who had suspected his temporizing tendencies.<sup>66</sup> According to Baillie, he gave the committee "full contentment" on every point, with only Digby and Seldon providing frequent opposition.<sup>67</sup> The faith of the "united front" was being justified. By means of the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance, which made no direct demand, the committee found itself in a position to deal directly with the very heart of episcopacy which was the power of sole ordination and jurisdiction.

### III.

The Scots were elated by the apparent success of their strategy and by the increasingly favorable attitude of both the king and parliament. During the early part of February, Charles began to look with great favor on Rothes and Loudoun,<sup>68</sup> while Henderson had at least one "very sweet" private conference with the king.<sup>69</sup> Moreover, at the instigation of Hamilton, seven of the English lords who were of reformist tendencies were appointed to the Privy Council.<sup>70</sup> The treaty negotiations were proceeding rapidly and favorably. The first six demands had already been granted by the sixth of February, and the seventh demand did not promise much difficulty.<sup>71</sup> Moreover, the voting of 300,000 pounds by the Commons as "a fit Proportion for that friendly Assistance and Relief . . . of our Brethren of Scotland"<sup>72</sup> gladdened the hearts of the Scots.<sup>73</sup> Furthermore, the fact that the House refused to allow ministers who had been ejected from Scotland to be preferred in England was an excellent indication of the direction in which sentiment was flowing.<sup>74</sup>

66 Baillie, *op. cit.*, 302-3, 307-8.

67 *Ibid.*, 303, 308. One clergyman present at the sessions of the committee declared that they were all rogues bent on pulling down episcopacy, and that he would shoot Dr. Burges, their leader, with his own hand. D'Ewes, *Journal*, 369-70.

68 *Ibid.*, 304.

69 *Ibid.*, 299.

70 Baillie calls them "all Commonwealth's men." *Ibid.*, 304.

71 *Ibid.*, 297.

72 *Journal of the House of Commons*, II, 78.

73 "The hearty giving of it to us, as to their brethren, did refresh us as much as the money itself." Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 297.

74 Nalson, *op. cit.*, I, 735.

In their elation, however, the Scots became somewhat overconfident and forgot to preserve the appearance of non-intervention in English affairs which they had maintained hitherto. Up to the latter part of February, they had been careful to work through their English allies. Even in their tracts and pamphlets, which were written anonymously, they had posed as Englishmen, but now in their zeal they flung caution to the winds.<sup>75</sup> Baillie, in his *A postscript for the personate Jesuit Lysimachus Nicanor*, wrote:

As for our neighbor Churches in *England* and *Ireland*, though hitherto we have been most sparing, to meddle with anything which concerneth them, yet now since you put us so hardly to it, we cannot dissemble any longer our hearty wishes, that since the Bishops there . . . have been the first fountain of all our Church's trouble, since they are the prime instruments which now infect this Isle with *Arminianism*, and *Popery*; since they have raised, and yet do further so hot a persecution against our whole nation in *Ireland* . . .; since after our full agreement with our gracious King, and neighbor nation *England* they have been the bellows to kindle the wrath of our King against us . . ., we profess it our wish to God, that the King and this present Parliament might seriously consider, if it were not for the good of the crown, for the welfare of their nation, for the peace of their church, that *England* after the example of all the reformed should rid themselves at last of their Bishops' trouble.<sup>76</sup>

These lines were at the printers on February 22, but before they were put on sale, a little broadside had been posted throughout London which blew the lid off the kettle.<sup>77</sup>

This incident was occasioned by some of the English peers, who had been appointed to the Privy Council at the instigation of Hamilton. Almost immediately they began to urge delay in the proceedings against Strafford. This provoked considerable criticism of the Scots as Baillie testifies.

Our Commissioners were deeply censured for advising the Marquis to promote these men untimely, (albeit I heard Loudoun deeply swear he

75 They should have heeded the warning of the man who, earlier in February, replied to Henderson's *The Unlawfulness and Danger of Limited Prelacy*. Although Henderson's book was written supposedly by an Englishman, this man discerned the Scottish authorship and said that it was "an unreasonable for their discipline to be pressed upon us as . . . for our Liturgy to be pressed upon them." *A Modest Advertisement concerning the present Controversy about Church-government, wherein the main grounds of that book, entitled, The Unlawfulness and Danger of Limited Prelacy, are calmly examined* (London, 1641). Quoted by J. D. Ogilvie, *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, I, 148.

76 Baillie, *Self-Conviction*, 36-37 of *A postscript* . . .

77 *From the Commissioners of Scotland*, 24 February, 1641. Reprinted in Spaulding's *Memorials*, II, 9-10.

never knew of any such motion till it was ended :) They were slandered as if they also had been to be admitted Counsellors of England . . . The Scots were everywhere said, for all their former zeal, to be so far broken by the King, that they were willing to pass from the pursuit of Canterbury, and the Lieutenant, and Episcopacy in England . . . The matter went so far, that the Londoners, after the money was collected, refused to give one penny of it for our army.<sup>78</sup>

To clear themselves, the Scottish Commissioners immediately, with some piece of passion, caused Mr. Alexander pen that quick little paper, proclaiming, against malice, the constancy of our zeal against Episcopacy, and the two Incendiaries.<sup>79</sup> This we gave to the Peers, requiring them with diligence to communicate it to the Parliament.<sup>80</sup>

Unfortunately for the Scots, this paper fell into the hands of a stationer by the name of Butter, who had it printed and posted throughout the city as the proclamation of the Scottish Commissioners.<sup>81</sup> At hearing of this, writes Baillie,

the King was so inflamed as he was never before in his time for any other business; for the keeping up of Episcopacy in England, which we strove to have down, is the very apple of his eye. The fury for some days did in nothing relent; the printer was committed; the paper was called an hundred times seditious. The King told us we had in justice forfeited our privileges.<sup>82</sup>

More serious for the Scots, however, than the anger of

78 Baillie, *Letters*, I, 305. Archibald Johnston wrote concerning this: "On a sudden, a storm has arisen here among us, occasioned by some devilish plot of our adversaries, whereof Traquair is not thought innocent—raising a slander against us, as growing remiss against the two incendiaries and episcopacy, that thereby we might be odious with the people, or, by our clearing ourselves, be odious to the King." *Memorials and Letters relating to the History of Britain in the Reign of Charles I*, collected by Lord Hailes, 107.

79 "What just indignation we had against those two incendiaries is known by our accusations . . . and by these also, besides our destestation expressed in all our words, writings, and actions, or judgements and intentions, against Episcopacy, both in Scotland and England, are in some measure expressed. We confess it were levity to be found building that which we have been pulling down, or to plant that which we have been plucking up." *From the Commissioners of Scotland, 24 February, 1641*. Spaulding's *Memorials*, II, 9.

80 Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 305. "This slander forced us to give in to the English commissioners a paper clearing ourselves, whereof some having caused print the copy, and affix it to all the common-places, as the Scots commissioners proclamation." Lord Hailes, *Memorials*, 107.

81 Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 305.

82 *Ibid.*, 306. Johnston wrote: "The King has run stark mad at it, and his council has been extremely offended at the printing of it in England, without the King's authority, and, upon our denial of any order for printing, they mind to recall it by public proclamation. But the King . . . said . . . that we were guilty of sedition, and that it was seditious libel, that he would make us repent of it, and that thereby we had lost our privilege, meaning our safe-conduct." Lord Hailes, *Memorials*, 107-8.

the king, was the opportunity which the publication of this paper afforded for the cultivation of a nationalistic resentment against the interference of the Scots in English internal affairs. D'Ewes informs us that this Scottish paper "raised one of the greatest distempers in the House that ever I saw,"<sup>83</sup> while Baillie reports that

divers of our true friends did think us too rash, and though they loved not the Bishops, yet, for the honor of their nation, they would keep them up rather than that we strangers should pull them down. That faction grew in a moment so strong, that in the very Lower House we were made assured by the most intelligent of our fastest friends, they would be the greater party. This put us in some perplexity: our army could not subsist without moneys; such a light accident had put all our enemies on their tip-toes, made sundry of our seeming friends turn their countenance, and too many of our true friends faint for fear. All this came justly upon us . . . we were fallen half asleep in a deep security, dreaming of nothing but a present obtaining of all our desires without difficulty.<sup>84</sup>

This slight mishap almost completely disrupted their carefully laid plans. A demand for religious uniformity as the final stipulation for the conclusion of the treaty negotiations and as the only basis for the establishment a permanent peace had been held in reserve by the coalition leaders as their trump card for securing religious change. By this hasty and precipitate action, however, the value of such a demand was greatly diminished.<sup>85</sup> If it had been presented at the right time and in the right manner, it might very well have become the instrumentality for the achievement of this objective. Couched in such vigorous language, however, and scattered broadside over London, instead of being submitted quietly to the English Commissioners, the desires of the Scots only served to arouse the patriotic fervor of many who had been dangling on the fence in regard to the religious question. Nevertheless, the paper was

83 D'Ewes, *Journal*, 418. Sir John Strangways started the furor by his vehement denunciation of the Scottish paper on February 27. *Ibid.*, 417 and note.

84 Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 306. In spite of this seemingly unfavorable reaction of the House, it must be noted that they refused to allow Strangways to read the Scottish paper before the House. D'Ewes, *Journal*, 417 and note.

85 "Evil will had we to say out all our mind about Episcopacy till the English were ready to join with us in that greatest of questions." *Letters*, I, 306. Johnston wrote: "We have been over-rash in suffering this to be printed, till we had formally given in our demand for the removal of episcopacy, with the reasons thereof." Lord Hailes, *Memorials*, 108. Not too much stress should be placed on the phrase "suffering this to be printed," for on the preceding page, in the same letter, Johnston denies that the Scots authorized the publication.



not without favorable results. The Londoners were "well pleased" by it,<sup>86</sup> and as a consequence were "content to lend 160,000 l. to the parliament . . ., which they refused before."<sup>87</sup>

Alarmed by the reaction to their "quick little paper," the Scots immediately set out to repair the damage.<sup>88</sup> In very humble and abject terms they wrote again to the English Commissioners.

We desire your Lordships to show to his Majesty and the Parliament, that in our last paper, . . . our intention and desire was merely to vindicate ourselves and our actions from certain aspersions . . . But as the printing of that paper had no warrant from nor order from us . . .; so was it far from our intentions either to give to his sacred Majesty the least cause of offense or to stir sedition, or make the smallest trouble in this Church and kingdom . . ., or to stretch ourselves beyond our line and to prescribe or give rules for reformation whether in Church or policy which cannot be expected but from his Majesty's own royal considerations and the wisdom and justice of the representative body of the kingdom now sitting in Parliament, in whose affairs we desire to have no further hand but in so far as they may concern us and the peace betwixt the two kingdoms . . . What we have . . . to propose . . . for settling of a firm and happy peace and nearer union betwixt the kingdoms . . . shall in its own place be remonstrate in such a way as may best give satisfaction and be furthest from all cause of offense.<sup>89</sup>

This statement placed the Scots in "a new pickle," for the English peers decided to publish the explanation, and "this rash and ignorant people would have taken for a recantation of what we had said before; so the last evils had been worse than the first."<sup>90</sup> Finally, however, they prevailed upon the Commissioners and the king not to publish it until they had submitted

86 Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 306.

87 Letter of Maitland. Lord Hailes, *Memorials*, 110.

88 J. D. Ogilvie, it seems to me, places too much significance on the Scottish paper of February 24. He feels that it blasted completely the hopes of the Scots, and that it was then "too late" to repair the damage. *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, I, 155. Baillie, for one, was far from dispirited after the initial uproar, as his subsequent letters show. Nor is it true, as Ogilvie affirms, that "Parliament no longer concerned itself about the reformation of the bishops if it could bring to an end their secular powers." *Ibid.*, 155-6. On the contrary, the various factions in the "united front," including the Scots, continued their active co-operation, and, after having been diverted for a time by the trial of Strafford, the Root and Branch Bill was introduced in the House of Commons on May 27. Indicative of the attitude of the lower House toward the Scots is the incident of April 26, when a member was suspended for declaring that many of the Scottish claims were dishonorable and that the Commons not only entertained them half-way but embraced them. *Journals of the House of Commons*, II, 128.

89 *State Papers Domestic, 1640-41*, 485-6.

90 Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 306-7.

their formal demands concerning episcopacy and its relation to the establishment of a permanent peace.

Good Mr. Alexander being somewhat grieved with the event of his former writing, set himself with more diligence to the accurate framing of the next; and after some days delay, gave out that most diligent expression of our desires of unity in the ecclesiastical government in all the King's dominions.<sup>91</sup>

This document has been called Henderson's "vision of peace," and it does present a very clear and concise statement of the Scottish objectives and endeavor in regard to the religious establishment in England.<sup>92</sup> After a very diplomatic and mollifying introduction, Henderson states the Scottish case.

Nothing so powerful to divide the hearts of people as division in religion; nothing so strong to unite them as unity in religion . . . In the paradise of nature the diversity of flowers and herbs is pleasant and useful; but in the paradise of the Church different and contrary religions are unpleasant and hurtful. It is therefore to be wished that there were one Confession of Faith, one form of Catechism, one Directory for all the parts of the public worship of God . . . , and one form of Church government in all the Churches of his Majesty's dominion.<sup>93</sup>

After commending the efforts of James in this direction, he goes on to say: "We do not presume to propound the form of government of the Church of Scotland as a pattern for the Church of England, but do only represent, in all modesty, these few considerations."<sup>94</sup> First, that the government of the Church of Scotland is like the Reformed churches abroad, while that of the Church of England is like the church of Rome. Secondly, that the Church of Scotland has been continually troubled and vexed by English bishops. Thirdly, that the Reformed churches insist that their government is "*de jure divino*" whereas episcopacy has been admitted by bishops to be a human institution, without warrant in scripture. Lastly, Scotland has rejected episcopacy by solemn oath and covenant, while England has rejected neither form of church government. Thus, it would be best to seek unity of religion on the basis of scripture, and by this means Charles could accomplish the design of James.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, 307.

<sup>92</sup> Reprinted in William M. Hetherington, *History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines* (New York, 1853), Appendix I, 330ff.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, 301-2.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*, 303.

As soon as Henderson had finished the final draft of this document, it was handed to the English lords with the request that it be immediately presented to parliament.<sup>95</sup> After several days' consideration of the matter, on March 15, the Lords replied:

His Majesty expects that according to your many professions and of that which is contained in your own paper you will not intermeddle with the Reformation in England but leave the care thereof to the King and kingdom. As likewise that you should not publish or divulge any discourses by which the subjects of this kingdom should be stirred up against the established laws of the kingdom but that you should acquiesce with this answer.<sup>96</sup>

The Scots sent back an answer the same day declaring that "a difference should be made between discourses to stir up the people . . . and the presenting in a humble and peaceable way to the King and parliament such things as are judged necessary for a permanent peace."<sup>97</sup> They entreated the Commissioners, since they had already shown this "mean of peace" to the king, to also show it to parliament.

In the meantime the strategy of the coalition forces seems to have changed. The "Committee of Thirty Against Church Government," as Verney calls it,<sup>98</sup> had reported as its second head for debate the question as to the sole power of bishops in ordination and jurisdiction, and with it had set forth certain reasons why presbyteries should be invested with those powers.<sup>99</sup> The first head, which dealt with the secular employment of bishops, had been handled with dispatch on the tenth and eleventh, when the Commons resolved to take away their votes in the House of Lords and to thrust them out of the secular courts.<sup>100</sup> Strangely enough, they did not move on to a con-

95 The demand that it be submitted to parliament was linked most likely to some bit of parliamentary strategy, for on March 9, the heads for debate on the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance had been reported out of committee. *Journal of the House of Commons*, II, 100.

96 *Historical Mss. Commission Reports*, X, appendix vi, 139.

97 *Ibid.*, 140.

98 *Verney Papers*, 4.

99 D'Ewes, *Journal*, 459.

100 "On Tuesday the 9th, as I remember, they gave them their first wound: after a long debate, at last unanimously, not ten contradicting, the Lower House decreed to move the Higher House, by bill to take from them voice in parliament. The next day they did the same for the Star Chamber, High Commission, Council, and all other secular courts. One of these days they are to cast down their cathedral deanries, and prebendries; also to spoil them of their usurped ordination and jurisdiction, to erect presbyteries in all the land, and distribute, in an equal proportion, the rents among all the parishes for preaching ministers." Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 308.

sideration of the second head, but jumped to the third, which was concerned with the revenues of the deans and chapters. Baillie, however, provides us with a clue as to the reason for this unusual procedure. The trial of Strafford was at last getting under way, and the Scots were advised, by their friends in parliament presumably, "that the present giving in of" their paper concerning religious uniformity, "might move division in both Houses, betwixt these who were diversely affected toward Episcopacy, and that any division among them, till Strafford's process were closed, might prove unhappy." So, says Baillie, "we were contented to lay by for a time that article till Strafford's affair were over."<sup>101</sup> Consequently, it did not disturb the Scots greatly when the English Commissioners replied to them on April 12 "that his Majesty commandeth us to adhere to his former answer, and conceive it most just you should acquiesce therewith."<sup>102</sup>

The latter part of March and the month of April were largely occupied with the trial of Strafford, but toward the beginning of May parliament began to be agitated by the fear of an "army plot;" and when, on Saturday the first of May, the king declared before both Houses "that in his conscience Strafford was free of all treason,"<sup>103</sup> the members of the lower House returned to their chamber in a high temper. Lest they do something rash on the spur of the moment, Pym advised that the House adjourn till Monday. Further developments over the week-end, however, only served to heighten the situation, and on Monday morning an indignant crowd of several thousand Londoners came down to Westminster and demanded justice against the Lieutenant.<sup>104</sup> Evidently, Pym had not been idle over the holiday, for in the midst of the clamor, the Commons locked itself in, whereupon Pym suggested the signing of a "protestation" for the defence of the realm and true religion. The first draft pledged the signers to the defence

101 *Ibid.*, 314.

102 *Historical Mss. Commission Reports*, X, appendix vi, 140. Nevertheless, on April 13, Bristol read *The Scots Declaration, concerning Uniformity of Church Government* before the House of Lords and at the same time reported on the subsequent exchange of notes. Bristol was thereupon ordered to make the same report at a conference between the two houses. *Journals of the House of Lords*, IV, 216.

103 Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 350.

104 D'Ewes gives the number as seven thousand. D'Ewes, *Autobiography*, II, 268.

of "the true, reformed, protestant religion,"<sup>105</sup> but upon some protest the qualifying clause, "as expressed in the Doctrine of the Church of *England*," was added.<sup>106</sup> It was expressly declared, however, that this did not include the government and ceremonies of the English church.<sup>107</sup> The next day, May 4, the members of the House of Lords added their signatures to the "protestation."<sup>108</sup> The Scots were delighted, and Baillie wrote home that they have subscribed "in substance our Scottish Covenant. God maketh our enemies the instruments of all our good. We see now, that it hath been in a happy time that so much time hath been lost about Strafford's head. But today, and hereafter, great things are expected."<sup>109</sup>

When the steering committee of the "united front" decided to defer action on the second "head" of the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance, concerning the sole power of bishops in ordination and jurisdiction, until after Strafford's final disposal, they had determined to proceed with the third "head" which dealt with the revenues of the deans and chapters. This had been moved on March 25, but with the Commons distracted by the trial of the Lieutenant, it had been deferred from day to day all during April. It was not until May 12, the day of Strafford's execution, that Dr. Burges and the other clergymen representing the remonstrants were summoned to appear before the House in order to begin the consideration of this matter.<sup>110</sup>

More important matters were at hand, however, for now the leaders of the Puritan group felt free to proceed against the bishops. The Scots, presumably at the advice of the same men who had formerly requested them to withhold their paper,

<sup>105</sup> *Verney Papers*, 67.

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*, 68.

<sup>107</sup> "At swearing and subscribing in the Lower House, it was declared expressly, by the doctrine they meant not the government and ceremonies, and that quickly they shall declare this, by ingiving of Bills against both." Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 352. On May 12, the Commons declared that by "'the true reformed Protestant Religion, expressed in the Doctrine of the Church of *England*' . . . was, and is meant only, the public Doctrine professed in the said Church, so far as it is opposite to Popery, and Popish Innovations; and that the said Words are not to be extended to the maintaining of any Form of Worship, Discipline, or Government; nor of any Rites or Ceremonies of the said Church of *England*." *Journals of the House of Commons*, II, 145.

<sup>108</sup> *Journals of the House of Lords*, IV, 233-4.

<sup>109</sup> Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 351.

<sup>110</sup> *Journals of the House of Commons*, II, 144, 145.



now published their *Desires concerning unity in religion*.<sup>111</sup> With the arguments thus given an open hearing, the Commons proceeded to remove the stigma of any foreign intervention by replying through the English Commissioners:

This House doth approve of the Affection of their brethren of *Scotland* in their Desire of a Conformity, in Church Government, between the Two Nations; and doth give them Thanks for it: And, as they have already taken into Consideration, the Reformation of Church Government, so they will proceed therein, in due time, as shall best conduce to the Glory of God, and the peace of the Church.<sup>112</sup>

Evidently the parliamentary leaders had begun to feel that they were the masters of the situation and that it was no longer necessary to bear the expense of maintaining the Scottish army in the northern counties as a threat to use against the court faction. Consequently, they wished to bring the treaty negotiations to a close at the earliest possible date. Since it would take some time to enact a bill providing for the abolition of episcopacy, it was necessary to dispense with demand for religious unity in the treaty. Nevertheless, without a doubt the Scots were given even stronger private assurances than that contained in the formal reply that their desires would be satisfied. In line with their promise of May 17, the Root and Branch Bill for the utter abolition of episcopacy was introduced in the House of Commons on May 27 by Sir Edward Dering.<sup>113</sup>

Tuesday morning, June 2, found Baillie and Blair in Gravesend, ready to sail for home. Only minor details remained to be settled in regard to the treaty; the Commons had finally begun the serious consideration of the matter of church

111 *Scots Commissioners, their desires concerning unity in religion, 1641*. Cited in note 92 in the modern reprinted version.

112 *Journals of the House of Commons*, II, 148. On June 8, the phrase "and of both Kingdoms" was added to the reply. *Ibid.*, p. 171. For the final statement in the treaty see Rushworth, IV, 368.

113 Dering seems to have acted as the dupe of the Presbyterian and Independent coalition, for he was not in agreement with the rest of the party. This deception was made possible by the fact that the bill as introduced did not contain the plan of church government which they intended should take the place of episcopacy. On June 21, Dering almost upset the apple cart by proposing his own scheme for the government of the church. *Ibid.*, 293-4; Nalson, *op. cit.*, II, 295. It should be pointed out that, in spite of the similarity of names, the Root and Branch Bill is not to be identified with the Root and Branch Petition. The Root and Branch Petition had not been reported out of committee and this bill probably was drawn up in accord with the second "head" of the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance.

government, and the two ministers were anxious to return to their charges from which they had been absent so long. Originally they had been granted leave to go to Newcastle for a conference, and when the dispatch of other clergymen from Scotland rendered their presence needless, they determined to take advantage of the leave thus granted to return home.<sup>114</sup> The others were soon to follow,<sup>115</sup> and when Henderson left, he carried with him a letter from some of the London clergy to the General Assembly

congratulating our happy proceeding, showing their hopes to get our discipline established there, telling that some of their brethren, who were for Independency of congregations, were great hinderance to that design; also that they did give out that some of the most eminent men in the ministry with us, inclined their way. The men they meant be (Mr. Henderson told us) were Mr. David Dickson, and Mr. Andrew Cant; but none in all the Assembly were more against Independency than these two.<sup>116</sup>

The religious struggle in England was beginning to shift from an attack on episcopacy to a conflict between the Presbyterians and Independents. In this, as in the earlier phase of the religious upheaval, both the Independents and the Presbyterians sought to capitalize on the prestige of the Scots.

In the meantime, however, the coalition forces in London were still functioning according to a prearranged strategy. On the evening of June 10, according to D'Ewes, a number of the members of the Commons, including Pym, Hampden, and Harley, met with a group of ministers headed by Stephen Marshall and determined to proceed with the consideration of the Root and Branch Bill on the following day. Sir Robert Stanley was appointed to make the motion.<sup>117</sup> On the following day, the motion having been made, Marshall hurried out to find

114 Baillie, *op. cit.*, I, 355. Baillie expected "the Bill of abolishing bishops" to effect a great alteration in many things within twenty days. *Ibid.*, 355-6.

115 The negotiations were concluded June 15. It then was ratified by the Scottish parliament and formally signed on August 10. In the meantime, Johnston, Henderson, Gillespie, Dunfermline, Loudoun, and perhaps the rest had returned to Scotland for the sessions of the General Assembly and Scottish parliament. *Ibid.*, 358, 362, 377.

116 *Ibid.*, 364. The letter and the reply of the Assembly are printed in the *Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 1638-1842* (Edinburgh, 1843) 49-51. Needless to say, the answer which Henderson wrote expressed the judgement of the Assembly against the confusions of Independency. Stephen Marshall was one of the signers of the London letter according to Alexander Gordon, *D.N.B.*, XII, 1129.

117 This passage is quoted in W. A. Shaw, *op. cit.*, I, 81-2.

D'Ewes who was walking in the gardens. As D'Ewes reports the incident, he

desired me to me to make haste thither, because they were in agitation about this great business for abolishing bishops. I told him I thought it was not possible, because I was but a little before come out of the House. He answered me that it was undoubtedly so, and that some of the House had determined to call for it today. I then asked him why I had no notice of this as well as others. He told me they were sure of me. I said aye, if you expect only my aye or no; but if you expect of me that I should speak in the cause, you should in civility have given me notice. As I hastened to my chamber near the hall to peruse anew those fragmentary notes which follow . . ., but before I could peruse them half over, Mr John More, a member of the House, came to my lodging to call me away, because the Bishops' Bill was in agitation.<sup>118</sup>

The fight was on, and the Scots were to be no longer at hand with their army to lend assistance. It is entirely within the realm of mere supposition, which for the historian is of little value, that the train of subsequent events might have been entirely different had not the treaty been concluded at this time. Nevertheless the continuing influence of the Scots plus the demand for uniformity in religion as an item in the final conclusion of the treaty might well have been sufficient to suppress the Independents, establish Presbyterianism, and thus form such a concord between the two kingdoms that Charles would not have dared rally his forces at Nottingham. When this course was finally attempted a year later by means of the *Solemn League and Covenant*, it was too late. By this time the Independents had grown in strength and numbers and the royalists were already in the field.

118 *Ibid.*, 82. John White seems to have spoken for the group in a speech which follows closely the pattern laid down by *Smectymnuus* and the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance, and advocates that the bishops be reduced to the rank of presbyters. Printed in *Speeches and Passages of this Great and Happy Parliament from the third of November, 1640, to this instant June, 1641* (London, Printed for William Cooke . . ., 1641), 417-431. The plan still was to appoint lay and clerical commissioners for every shire as an interim form of government until the time was ripe for the calling of a National Assembly. This was disclosed by the young Vane when he interrupted Dering's speech on June 21. Rushworth, *op cit.*, IV, 293; Nalson, *op. cit.*, 295.

## BOOK REVIEWS

### HISTORY AND THE GOSPEL

By CHARLES HAROLD DODD. New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1938.  
189 pages. \$2.00.

This work constitutes an attempt to show, with particular reference to Christianity, that history is "to be judged not as a simple process in time, but as a process determined by the creative act of God vertically from above." While the Gospel story remains an enigma for the historian, the "New Testament makes sense of it, but only by recognizing in it the entry into history of a reality from beyond history."

Dr. Dodd, as an authority in the field of Biblical criticism, concedes merit in the modern critical school's denial both that the "quest of the historical Jesus" succeeded in reconstructing Christianity on a basis of historical fact, scientifically assured, and that the historical character of the Gospels is to be emphasized rather than the religious. The recent turn of theologians to transcendence and the revolt against "historicism" are both justified. Nevertheless, for Christianity "the eternal God is revealed in history"; and history consists of "events which are of the nature of occurrence *plus* meaning." Thus, "we may describe the story of the Gospels as a narrative of events whose meaning is eschatological, that is to say, events in which is to be discerned the mighty act of the transcendent God which brings history to fulfilment." Christian eschatology is, of course, a "realized" eschatology.

Within the New Testament there is a central tradition which bears historical trustworthiness. The two aspects, readily recognized in the tradition, are the "preaching" which calls the church into existence and the "teaching," an ethical ideal for corporate and individual life. The picture of the church as a prophetic community in Paul's writings is not antagonistic to the acceptance of the basic traditionalism. The "Jesus of history" is regulative from the start.

In the results both of source-criticism and of form-criticism is found ample proof that "the Christian Church grew up around a central tradition." It is reasonable to presume the interpretation placed on the "coherent picture of Jesus Christ" "was imposed by the facts themselves and gave rise to historical consequences." The historical existence of the church is best seen in the proclamation of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments. Paul points to the Gospel and the Supper as primitive. The Word of the Gospel declares what "God has done in sending His Son" and is "an actual factor in history." The church is the instrument of divine intervention in history. Preaching is "designed to place the hearers in the very presence of the historical event; thus, the church "mediates the power of God to every age." "It is this that gives

character to the Church, that it lives always . . . within the historical moment of its redemption."

Creation and Last Judgment, as well as the Fall, are symbolic statements only—mythological. Upon the field of "an indecisive conflict between the recalcitrant will of man and the true divine meaning of man himself and his world, that sacred history supervenes, telling how the victory is won through a dying to the world and a resurrection in power."

To the reviewer this work appears to be a brilliant achievement in bringing together into a smooth scheme of interpretation some very substantial results of New Testament criticism and some quite debatable claims as to the nature and function of the church.

Evanston, Illinois.

Henri R. Percy.

### ESSENTIAL CHRISTIANITY

By S. ANGUS. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1939. xxv, 223 pages. \$2.00.

Well known in church history by his *Early Environment of Christianity* and other books dealing with religion in this time, Professor Angus here professedly writes not for students but for laymen. Despite insistence that the task is impossible, the attempt to define essential Christianity is perennially interesting to laymen and the clergy alike. A preliminary question is "essential for what?" "Essential for a system," a body of doctrine asserted to state a right understanding of Christianity, is one answer. Another goes to the extreme of "essential for salvation," assuming that there are tenets assent to which is the condition of salvation. In both of these answers the intellectualist concern dominates. Professor Angus says "essential Christianity is that which is essential for the purpose of Christ in human life and in society now." "It is that which produces Christian manhood and womanhood as the richest and most creative and unitive force in the world." Again, "essential Christianity must demand one thing—Christlikeness." While thus the ethical interest rules his conception of Christianity, his thought never approaches moralism, but is always profoundly religious; "This faith in God through Jesus Christ which is the very nerve of the Christian religion."

The words just quoted suggest what in the author's view is "essential," what will perform "the task of Christianity," that is "the production of Christlike character." "It is not enough to realize that God is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. He must become our God and Father before the Christian religion endues us with power from on high . . . we must pass on to explore God as did Jesus, and to live in God by faith like that of Jesus, however weaker and more fitful our faith." Christianity, it is emphasized, is "an historical religion but not based on history." It "is above history in that its deepest experiences are immediate." "History may be the means of our entry into the secret place of the Most High, but in that region only is essential Christianity, the religion which Jesus lived and taught." So much has been quoted that the author may speak for himself. He sharpens his meaning by setting his conception of what is essential over



against what comes from institutional authority and what is bound up in historical dogma. "Essential Christianity" is an affair of personal contemporary fellowship with God through Christ. Being such, it cannot be static, but grows and changes to meet the changes of life. "Christianity has lived and manifested its vitality by changing; in fact, the more it changes the more it has been itself." All this is no new conception, but it is stated here with original conviction.

If Professor Angus must be classified theologically, he would be rated a liberal, and probably would cheerfully endure any consequent estimation of being out of fashion. He decisively rejects the fundamentalist definition of what is essential. He is anything but authoritarian. But he is free from the weaknesses ascribed to liberalism. His Christian faith is passionately certain, and his section on "The Religion of the Cross in Life" gives no toleration to an easy interpretation of "Christlikeness." It could be wished that he had repeated himself less. His book would be more effective if either it had been shorter or had discussed further what has already been well stated. Yet it is a powerful expression of a conception of Christianity which, if under some fire just now, is so well grounded that it will endure. The book is for laymen. It would be interesting to see if the versions of Christianity held in quarters whence the fire would come could be stated so as to appeal to Christian lay people as *Essential Christianity* will.

Auburn Theological Seminary.

Robert Hastings Nichols.

### GREAT CATHOLICS

Edited by CLAUDE WILLIAMSON, O.S.C. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1939. 456 pages. \$2.50.

*Great Catholics* presents to its readers thirty-one biographies of men and of six women who achieved excellence in various walks of life. Each biography is written by an author of note. Naturally, English and American personalities predominate with sixteen studies. Apparently, the subjects were selected with a view to available contributors, so that we cannot argue about unmerited inclusion or exclusion of certain celebrities. Yet every great personage was included for showing some traits of piety. The book bears the stamp of modernity. Austere monks and hermits are excluded and the greatness is presented in traits which appeal to the modern world. Even the cloistered nun is not remarkable for the practice of austerities. All the biographies are character studies with a minimum of biographical data. In St. Augustine, the doctrinal viewpoint is too much stressed at the expense of the portrait of his personality. St. Anthony of Padua found a biographer who is rather apologetical in the introduction. St. Catherine of Siena is made appealing to our age by describing her political activity as peace-maker. The English nun, Jane Stuart, and the French nun, Julie Billiart, present striking pictures of female educators making the best of national traits. The description of the characteristic traits is at times more verbose than lucid. Digressions mar the text at times. Sometimes an author is very apologetical about the particular way of holy living of his hero and thereby reveals striking differences in Catho-

lic practice. One seldom comes across positive misstatements. The democratic theory of Suarez lost ground, since Pope Leo XIII put forth a mild divine-right theory. That liberty of conscience was the fruit of the Reformation (p. 280) will hardly be admitted by any historian. C. C. Martindale does not forget that he is an Englishman, and his study of Paul the Apostle is made the vehicle of an apology for the Englishman's reputed dislike of propaganda (p. 6). *Great Catholics* will serve its purpose admirably in regard to readers who lost their taste for Caxton's *Golden Legend* or Butler's *Lives of the Saints*.

St. Augustine Monastery, Pittsburgh, Pa. John M. Lenhart, O.M.Cap.

### THE VATICAN AS A WORLD POWER

By JOSEPH BERNHART. Translated by George N. Shuster. New York, London: Longmans, 1939. 456 pages. \$4.00.

This is a welcome book, written by an authority intimately conversant with the subject. It is an interpretive historical essay on the papacy and the church, stressing the inner history of these institutions and how they have been and still are interwoven with secular affairs. The book is written to strengthen the faith of the reader in the papacy as guardian of the "keys" originally transmitted to Peter, the first bishop of Rome; nevertheless, the author readily admits that rational opposing arguments can be stated. He even points out many of the unsavory facts of papal history.

Although Hitler and Mussolini are not mentioned, the author explains how the totalitarian theories of the state are fundamentally in conflict with the ideals and purposes of the Catholic church, and how the attitude of all spiritual-minded people will naturally oppose these excessive claims of the present-day states. He condemns the "Nihilism of unbelief" and the secularization of religion by states that results from making sacred those things that are profane. The last chapter, entitled "The Curia," contains an excellent description of the organization and customs of the papal court.

The style is compact; there are frequent expressive figures of speech. The character sketches and biographical portraits are masterly. Of the numerous terse, aphoristic statements there is space to quote only one: "History is a giant which breathes in long breaths, and makes known the true meaning of events only after those affected are in their graves" (p. 330). This is expressive of the apparent motive of the writer; he will let history be judge of this longest-lived of western institutions.

The translation (from the second German edition) is excellently done. There are few typographical errors: "Modena" for "Medina" (p. 76); "divinsées" for *divinisées* (348); "Castozza" for "Custozza" (359); the dates of Pius VI are 1775-1799, not 1775-1779 (399). The Syllabus of Errors contained eighty, not sixty, condemned propositions (364). On pages 314 and 321 "whom" is used as a nominative. The index is complete as to persons; more subject entries would have been acceptable to the reader.

University of Colorado.

C. C. Eckhardt.

## THE GATEWAY TO THE MIDDLE AGES

By ELEANOR SHIPLEY DUCKETT. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1938. xiii, 620 pages. \$5.00.

This exposition of the intellectual and spiritual history of the West in the sixth century is not developed in a vacuum, but with a full awareness of the turbulent political and social forces of the age. Although of the eleven chapters six are devoted to Italy, space is found for substantial treatment of the life and thought of France, Britain, and Ireland. The work opens with a long chapter recounting the lurid story of the conflict of Roman and barbarian powers in Italy from Theodoric, the Goth, to Theudelinda, the Lombard queen. Against this background the figures of the intellectual saviors of the time—Cassiodorus, Jordanes, Ennodius, Boethius—are in turn delineated. With impartial justice Miss Duckett evaluates the characters, talents, and services of these revered authors and leaders. Cassiodorus, for all his loyalty to religion, learning, and peace, is found capable of courtly insincerity. Ennodius, though he "delighted in brave and holy men," condoned Theodoric's treacherous massacre of the clan of Odovacer. Boethius appears the most blameless soul in that soul-testing generation. His figure dominates the chapter, "Philosophy in the Sixth Century," in which he appears not only as philosopher, educator, and martyr to political honesty, but also as a theologian of importance.

Our author draws "a picture of France" from the record provided by Gregory of Tours, who knew his Franks better than he knew his grammar. Romantic admirers of the primitive Nordic will do well to ponder this realistic account of crowned criminals and their she-devil consorts, and of the depraved nobility of the dominant race—men and women whose sins were like crimson. Miss Duckett does not argue, but her well-told story should convince the unprejudiced of the extreme difficulty of the task of leaders of religion and culture amid these heedless barbarians. Even the third-rate poets who next engage our attention assume a certain dignity in such an environment; and in their midst stood one who was not third-rate, Venantius Fortunatus, author of a hymn that has outlived the generations since, the *Vexilla regis prodeunt*. Chiefly for his innovations in verse form, Miss Duckett places Fortunatus "first in a long line of Latin mediaeval poets."

The sorrowful pages of Gildas afford the principal materials for "a picture of Britain," though other sources are not neglected. Two chapters on monasticism follow. The title, "Roman Monasticism," is hardly justified by the material placed under it, which has to do mainly with the work of Cassiodorus in southern Italy and of Caesarius in southern Gaul. "Celtic Monasticism" receives careful treatment; it is hard to see that its sixth century history could have been better presented within sixty pages. What the chapter lacks on the side of the Welsh phases is supplied in the previous chapter on Britain with its account of Gildas. The recent literature in the field seems to have been adequately studied. There is, however, only an incidental reference to Wade-Evans, *Welsh Christian Origins*; apparently our author did not regard the startling revisions proposed in

that work as worthy of consideration. The last two chapters deal respectively with Benedict of Nursia and Gregory the Great. There is some logical justification for closing a book on the sixth century with the constructive leaders of monasticism and the secular church; but chronologically it is confusing to reserve Benedict until Cassiodorus and Columban have entered and left the stage.

It should be emphasized that this book, although "intended for the general reader," is no cheap popularization or patchwork of materials from other scholars. It is essentially the product of the author's own gleanings out of a wide range of source reading. The text is interspersed with well selected and vigorously translated quotations of source documents. The style is lively and often highly pictorial. There are, it is true, some unchastened expressions ("ringing Gothic gutters," p. 13, and a jarring comparison of sixth century writers to the "last sounds from the train of Italy's culture before it plunges into the tunnel of the Dark Ages," p. 211); but, considering the sustained vividness of the language of the work, these are very infrequent. The author's intellectual energy has triumphed over a body of labor that would have wearied to dullness the brain of many a less gifted historian. Dissent from her judgment on some difficult points (such as the birth date of Gildas) may still be permissible. There are exceedingly few definite errors in fact, and these, so far as the present reviewer has noted, lie outside the sixth century. Miss Duckett allows herself to say (p. 176) that John Scotus Erigena "presided over the Palace School at Aachen in the time of Charles the Bald." Ninth century scholars are uncertain of the location of Charles the Bald's Palace School; possibilities are Laon and Paris, and the school may have moved freely with the court. But Aachen is excluded, since it lay outside the domain of Charles. Again she refers incidentally to Clovis as having been "Arian in his earlier allegiance" (p. 217), although a later page records his conversion from paganism to Catholic orthodoxy.

The defects of the book have to be sought out with diligence; its merits are evident everywhere, and are such as to make it a work of importance. Far removed from a merely pedestrian and encyclopedic chronicle of facts, it brings the reader to an intimate realization of sixth century life and thought in those areas of Europe in which men's words and deeds were chiefly significant for history.

The University of Chicago.

John T. McNeill.

#### SOLDIER OF THE CHURCH THE LIFE OF IGNATIUS LOYOLA

By LUDWIG MARCUSE. Translated and edited by Christopher Lazare. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1939. vii, 352 pages. \$2.50.

No effort is required to read this book. On a second reading it is even more interesting. It is written in freedom, which is not, as in the case of some recent "jazzy" biographies, a freedom from restraint of facts. The book obviously rests on competent command of the materials. Though there are no footnotes, remarkable knowledge of Loyola and his times is evident.

Some of the interest comes from pictures of the times. Many of these, while not strictly relevant, contribute to a realization of Loyola's world. Some of them, vivid and entertaining, really are too far away, for example Cortez in Mexico. In comparatively few pages Dr. Marcuse stretches a broad canvas and fills it with bright scenes and figures, a few of which seem painted in for their own sake. Yet never does the reader's eye wander far from the central dominating personality. The man's accomplishments are described in subordination to his character. He is painted in a dry light. The author is not laudatory, apologetic, hostile, cynical; he is not trying to overcome prejudice or partiality in himself or his readers; he is as far as possible from sentimentality. The result is most convincing. The defect of the author's attitude is that question is inspired as to his sympathy with his subject's religious certainty, though Loyola's mystical devotions are not neglected.

The *motif* sounds in the title, "soldier." What this means appears in a sentence describing the young Loyola: "Lūigo had learned . . . that there is only one betrayal for the soldier, rational thinking, refusal to sacrifice blindly to the idol Obedience." His conversion, of which a lifelike account is given, wrought "no fundamental change of motive or desire." "As subject and retainer of the grandee, the emperor and the Christ, he, Loyola, could march on to glory, despite the French cannon-ball. The soldier looked about for exploits on the new terrain." This interpretation is not new; what is new here is the consistency of its working out. Obedience is traced through the spiritual struggles in which Loyola attained self-mastery and through his early service where his submission to authority never failed. It is most strikingly exemplified in his loyalty to the Pope. "The Pope, whoever he was, was above criticism. The Pope, Paul or Julius, was always the master; Ignatius always the servant . . . To the Platonist, Loyola, a good idea justified even the worst man." Obedience again stands out in the scenes from Loyola's unwearied inexorable ruling of the Society. "The main office in Rome . . . pumped its inexhaustible energy into its farthest outposts by means of thousands of little letters." The chapter "Purge in Portugal," describing Loyola's subjection of Simon Rodriguez, is unforgettable. His disciples "were to desire of their own accord whatever was commanded. Compulsory obedience produced sullenness and stupidity. The father wanted open-hearted, eager sons. The students must, with their entire heart and being, will what their superior willed . . . He made greater demands than any tyrant, any general, any demagogue; he wanted the free, candid, sincere aggressive yes men."

It is impossible not to think that this interpretation is sharpened in the consciousness of one who has fled from a comparable regime in Germany. This applies also to the emphasis on another *motif* in Loyola, which Dr. Marcuse considers a fundamental weakness, his reliance on material power. "Like the Chief in Rome, Xavier the travelling representative, was convinced that Christ must ally himself with the mightiest earthly power . . . Christ's diplomats, Ignatius of Loyola and Francisco Xavier committed, in this connection, the same significant error which had undermined their Lord for centuries." "The man of iron will at Rome who was magnificently determined to enforce his concept on all humanity . . . would not raise a



finger (and in this respect again he resembled his great adversary Luther) against the divine order of kings." "He did not discriminate between *de facto* power and divine power—a significant precursor of Hegel." Loyola is made the instrument of an irrepressible protest: "as a hero he served the forever unheroic: force."

Along with the study of the central character, Dr. Marcuse describes realistically the methods of the Jesuits in their early ministry, giving understanding of how they gained influence. The translation is so good that it reads like an original.

Auburn Theological Seminary.

Robert Hastings Nichols.

### THE RISE OF PURITANISM

By WILLIAM HALLER. New York: Columbia University Press, 1938. viii, 464 pages. \$4.50.

Puritan literature has been enriched by three outstanding books which have appeared within the last year: William Haller's *The Rise of Puritanism*, Marshall Knappen's *Tudor Puritanism*, and A. S. P. Woodhouse's *Puritanism and Liberty*.

*The Rise of Puritanism* developed from the author's interest in Milton and his reaction to the seventeenth century background. Fundamentally, the book is a survey of Puritan propaganda during the period 1570-1643, beginning with the expulsion of Cartwright from Cambridge, and ending with the Westminster Assembly, when the Puritan utopia was about to be realized. A sub-title to this work might well have been, *A Biography of the Puritan Mind*, for it is the story of the transmutation of the Pauline *Epistles* and the *Institutes* of Calvin into an English ideological pattern and a consequent code of behavior. When we remember that this pattern of thought and behavior was one of the significant reasons for the rending of the English fabric during the Interregnum, the examination of Puritan pulpit literature, techniques, and convictions becomes a significant story. The subject of that story, the preacher, assumes a rôle in English history far from unimportant.

The book is replete with the names, lives, and writings of the Puritans, not only of significant men but also of their lesser known contemporaries. By means of the pulpit these men popularized the Bible, and dramatized the Puritan epic of the spiritual life. The succinct descriptions of these preachers and teachers constitute one of the most valuable features of the book (e. g., the characterization of William Perkins, pp. 91 f.). In estimating the Puritan character, Professor Haller, like Macaulay, has understood that the external badges, those odious peripheral aspects, are not the primary qualities of the Puritan mind and heart. Unlike Macaulay, he has indicated that many Puritans were not contemptuous of human learning, but rather were men of understanding and penetrating intellect—men ever learning for the sake of coming to a knowledge of the truth, but subsuming all earthly wisdom under the dominating concept of knowing and doing the will of God.

In estimating the value of Puritan diaries and autobiographies—lying unheralded and unread in the archives—Professor Haller acutely states that “the psychological function of the Puritan autobiography and diary was primarily the same as that of auricular confession.” From the pages of these diaries came forth not the dictum of some priest, but an inner dynamic that accounts for the driving force of Puritanism in history. Psychiatry was an unknown word to the Puritan, but the gist of that symbol—scrupulous self-examination—was keenly experienced by them.

Without cavilling, one finds it difficult to differ basically with the judgments of the author. But a few doubts in the mind of the reviewer may not be amiss. The statement that “the history of Puritan thought in England is primarily the history of the setting forth of the basic doctrine of predestination” (p. 85) seems too categorical. It relegates to a secondary position such doctrines as the inspiration of the Scriptures, the grace of God, faith, walking in the spirit of Christ. Again, when Professor Haller asserts that Presbyterianism would have proved a worse tyranny than prelacy (p. 225), he is dealing with history in the subjunctive mood. After all, Presbyterianism was more democratic than Laudian prelacy, and aided in making it more comprehensive after 1672. Perhaps the Presbyterianism of Baillie, Cheynell, or Prynne would have been worse, but not the kind embraced by Baxter, Calamy, or Gouge.

Professor Haller believes that “the outpourings of Prynne and his fellows were but incidental currents, best ignored, in the running stream of the intellectual life of the time” (p. 235). The splenetic literature after 1640 seems to belie any such “incidental” characterization. Prynne’s mind would be better characterized as dogmatic or restricted rather than “infertile” (p. 369). The fulminations of Prynne, incidental to a modern reader, were powerful because of their excess, their dramatic distortions, their inflamed passions. Prynne was in the stream where the currents flowed most swiftly.

The date 1621 in reference to Henry Burton is either a mistake or a misprint, since Charles did not ascend the throne until 1625 (p. 251).

Despite these minutiae, Professor Haller has produced a quality book, eminently readable. His use of metaphor may be a happy result of those spicy, pungent figures of speech abundant in Puritan literature. The spirit of the period is laid hold upon, and consequently the reader not only feels the extraordinary vitality of Puritan thought, and the sacrificial character of their actions, but also draws near to the central fire that burns in the pages of writers dominated by a great religious ideal.

North Park College, Chicago, Illinois.

Leland H. Carlson.

#### ANNUAL CATALOGUE OF GEORGE FOX'S PAPERS

By HENRY J. CADBURY. Philadelphia: Friends Book Store, 1939. 219 pages. \$5.00.

This a revised and enlarged edition of the *Annual Catalogue of George Fox's Papers* compiled between 1694-1698 and kept in the Friends Reference Library, Friends House, London. It contains the basic source material

for the writings of George Fox, "the raw material of research in general and particularly biographical use in the future study of Fox."

The practice, followed in the original catalogue and in this, of listing the writings by an opening sentence or so of each work, gives the uninitiated reader quite a stimulus toward looking into the published works, and should consequently interest more students in the life and writings of this English mystic, of whom William Penn said, "The most awful, living, reverent frame I ever felt or beheld was in his prayer."

The University of Chicago.

Paul G. Morrison.

### JOHN WESLEY

By FRANCIS J. McCONNELL. New York: Abingdon Press, 1939. 355 pages. \$3.00.

Among the numerous biographies of Wesley, this study by the erudite Methodist bishop is in some particulars the best. Not as comprehensive as Father Piette's famous work, not so meticulous in detail as the old standard work of Tyerman, it surpasses these as well as other notable lives in its marvelous interpretative quality. Avoiding the "scoop-shovel" method of introducing all available material, the author wisely selects the major factors, weighing all evidence cautiously and handling difficult problems dispassionately and with sure discrimination. The reader will be impressed with the penetrating insights, the plausible explanations of doubtful matters, the judicious avoidance of extremes whether of eulogy or of depreciation. Although not of the debunking type of biographical writers, the author is sufficiently keen in critical analysis to satisfy the sceptics.

Many varied fields of knowledge are drawn upon for illustrations. The inimitable personal "asides" frequently introduced are refreshing and illuminating, always to the point and invariably apt. The Aldersgate experience is definitely established, against Piette, in its larger historical significance. Wesley's relation to Calvinism and to antinomianism is thoroughly clarified against Dr. Cell's one-sided emphasis (in *The Rediscovery of John Wesley*). The Wesleyan connection with mysticism is sanely treated. We find a healthy rehabilitation of some of the members of the Wesley household, a much needed antidote to an otherwise fascinating narrative, *Son to Susanna*. We also meet a slightly higher appreciation of the "mean, low, sordid" eighteenth century including the "pagan" University of Oxford.

Wesley himself is handled without gloves. His defects are given adequate consideration, his strange acts and a number of fantastic notions he entertained are explained, his autocratic disposition is frankly conceded, as well as his lack of humor. His dealings with women, his masterful handling of crowds, and his expert utilization of mass psychology, are all given due consideration. In short, the book is unquestionably the most brilliant interpretation as well as one of the profoundest studies ever made of the great English reformer.

Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.

A. W. Nagler.

## PAPAL CONFLICT WITH JOSEPHINISM

By Sister MARY C. GOODWIN. New York: Fordham University Press, c. 1938. xiii, 157 pages. \$2.00.

This doctoral dissertation bears the usual stamp of such writings. The author has collected and utilized a large number of source and secondary materials, and has depicted the events with fulness and cogency.

But she is unmistakably defending a thesis: namely, that the papacy was generally right and the policy of Emperor Joseph II fundamentally wrong. Accordingly, one does not find in her work any attempt to present adequately the reasons why the Emperor, who was admittedly a devout Catholic, waged such unrelenting conflict with even such a mild-mannered pope as Pius VI. She asserts that Joseph would have been in his rights had he, "with the sanction of the Pope confined himself to the correction of the abuses and misuses only" (p. 125), although that policy would not have removed such fundamental causes of dissatisfaction and such wrongs as the legal prohibition and suppression of all Protestantism in a large part of the Empire. Her description of the famous Toleration Patent of 1781 is inexact. She says, "Thus there appeared early in 1781, several edicts of toleration of all religious creeds in the Empire. The first, issued June 30, 1781, declared that henceforth, in no way, was any distinction to be made between Catholics and Protestants" (p. 57). In the first place, Roman Catholicism remained the sole religion of the Emperor's hereditary dominions, and the non-Catholics were merely *tolerated*; and secondly, until 1861, these tolerated communities suffered all manner of discrimination, some of which was in accordance with official regulations; and in the third place, only two Protestant confessions—Lutheran and Reformed—were permitted, although the majority of the non-Catholics wished to revive such native communions as the Unity of Czech Brethren, or proclaimed themselves to be "Husites," whatever that meant.

The book is not free from a considerable number of minor inaccuracies, of which the following may be mentioned: Bolingbroke is twice referred to as Mailand (62); and what appears to be Mogilev on the Dnieper is designated "Mohileu in Lithuania" (pp. 32, 33).

The Chicago Theological Seminary.

Matthew Spinka.

## CATHOLICISM IN NEW ENGLAND TO 1788

By ARTHUR J. RILEY. Washington: The Catholic University of America, 1936. ix, 479 pages. \$1.25.

Until within the last few years, American Catholic historians have confined their efforts chiefly to recounting the positive aspects of Catholic activity in this country. In consequence, the great bulk of their work has taken the forms of diocesan histories, biographies, and histories of missions and institutions. Only incidentally have they turned their attention to the study of the repercussions, on the Catholic body, of movements and attitudes outside of, and often inimical to, their church. In 1936, however,

three works of the latter approach were published by American Catholic scholars: Charles H. Metzger's *The Quebec Act* (United States Catholic Historical Society Monograph Series, XVI), Sister Mary Augustina Ray's *American Opinion of Roman Catholics in the Eighteenth Century* (Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, No. 416), and the volume under review (The Catholic University of America Studies in American Church History. Vol. XXIV.)

Dr. Riley's work is also significant for another reason. New England is almost the last considerable section of the country to receive any measure of study of its Catholic history according to the canons of the new school of American Catholic historiography. Sister Marie Celeste Leger inaugurated the new study of the church in New England with her *The Catholic Indian Missions in Maine (1611-1820)*, (The Catholic University of America Studies in American Church History, Vol. VIII, Washington, 1928). Dr. Riley's work may safely be acclaimed the most significant contribution to the Catholic historical literature of this area since the publication of Sister Marie Celeste's study.

The major portion of the present volume is taken up with the study of the colonial New England mind in its attitude towards the Catholic church and things Catholic. In pursuance of this objective, the author has resorted to a vast amount of the extant and accessible sources of information—contemporary sermons, lectures, text-books, catechisms, almanacs, pamphlets, diaries, and the like. Gleanings extracted from these sources have been supplemented by a careful study of the legislation of the period. Inventories of typical libraries of the time have been studied when available in order to learn the reading tastes of the population in matters connected with Catholic belief and practice.

From the great abundance of information furnished by these sources, Dr. Riley has been able to effect a comprehensive analysis of the major factors that went to the making of this New England *milieu*. The picture he presents is not pleasant to this later generation committed to a larger measure of toleration towards conscientious differences in religious belief. But the author has studied deeply enough to appreciate the manifold implications of this aspect of the Puritan mind. His researches have carried him far enough to enable him to appreciate the mettle and the philosophy of those committed to this attitude. The learning, sincerity, and religious-mindedness of the opposition he freely acknowledges.

The last chapter of the work is given over to a consideration of the number of Catholics in colonial New England. It is very doubtful if future research will alter in any appreciable degree his conclusion that their numbers were few. Some eleven pages are devoted to the intriguingly interesting subject of the New England captives in Canada. Appendix E, consisting of fourteen tables of statistics relating to this group, contains an amount of information nowhere else so readily accessible. The bibliography of sixty-eight pages is particularly rich in its chronological citation of the more influential New England almanacs, published sermons and lectures, catechisms, text-books, and other pertinent sources.

Saint Michael's College,  
Winooski Park, Vermont.

Thomas F. O'Connor.



THE FOUNDING OF AMERICAN CIVILIZATION  
THE MIDDLE COLONIES

By THOMAS JEFFERSON WERTENBAKER. New York and London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1938. xiii, 367 pages. \$3.00.

With the appearance of this volume, Professor Wertenbaker, Edwards Professor of American History at Princeton University, begins a new series of studies on colonial culture. Princeton is in the heart of what was once the Middle Colonies and it is quite appropriate that the first volume should deal with New Jersey and the neighboring colonies. The author promises future volumes on the civilization of the Southern and New England colonies.

A basic fact in the history of American civilization is that America took the poor of Europe and lifted them into the middle class. It not only transformed European peasants and English yeomen into prosperous landholders, skilled artisans, and successful tradesmen, but also into clergymen, doctors, lawyers, and even into artists and scholars. In no other section of the colonies in this transformation process more in evidence than in the Middle Colonies. Each of the many immigrant groups brought its own cultural influence. The English Quaker, generally of humble origin, the Dutch merchant in New Amsterdam, the Swedish farmers on the Delaware, and the German peasants and Scotch-Irish immigrants, all made their distinctive contributions. Each brought his ways of ordinary life; his language; his tools; his architecture; his arts and crafts; his methods of agriculture, and not least his peculiar religious ideas and his church organization. All these contributions are considered in this volume, but it is very evident that the author's particular interest is in Middle Colony architecture.

The author's treatment of the religious groups in the Middle Colonies is fairly adequate for the Reformed Dutch, the Puritans who migrated from New England to northern New Jersey, and for the Quakers. But this cannot be said of the German bodies, or to a large degree of the Scotch-Irish. The author has permitted his interest in the Pennsylvania German's farm house and great barn, his fields and orchards, to crowd out the German contributions to the life of the spirit, which may, in the long run, be more important than houses and barns. Among other things that are missing is any appreciation of the development of educational movements and the press. The "Log College" movement in the Middle Colonies is not mentioned nor is there any appraisal of the publishing activities so well developed in Germantown and Philadelphia particularly. An account of the cultural significance of the Ephrata group and the Moravian communities at Nazareth and Bethlehem is also missing.

The principal contribution of the volume lies in its informing and always interesting treatment of the development of Middle Colony architecture. In fact, it would seem that much of the other materials introduced is here primarily to furnish some setting for the presentation of the author's main interest. We are grateful for the excellence of this portion of the book, but regret that so much of importance has been neglected. In fact,

so great is the amount of essential material omitted that another volume of equal size would be necessary to fill the gaps.

The University of Chicago.

William W. Sweet.

### THE HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY IN AMERICA

By FRANK GRENVILLE BEARDSLEY. New York: American Tract Society. 244 pages. \$1.50.

This is a very commendable condensation and simplification of the development of religious movements in America. The book should serve as an excellent introduction for those who are entirely unacquainted with the subject, for it is vastly superior to the usual "patriotic denominational" manner in which most American church history has been written. The title, however, is far too ambitious for a volume of this size dealing with the subject, since little more than an outline is possible within its modest limits.

The first three chapters are devoted to the religious "beginnings" of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries in the several regions along the Atlantic seaboard. Two brief chapters, one entitled "The Great Awakening" and the other "The Revolutionary Era," rather inadequately cover the eighteenth century. Seven chapters indicate the trends in the nineteenth century, and the volume is concluded with two chapters dealing with the twentieth.

While this book makes little or no original contribution, it is apparent that Dr. Beardsley has made use of most of the latest scholarly writings in this field. Due to its brevity, omissions are necessarily numerous and the absence of a bibliography makes it impossible to determine which of these are deliberate and which are not.

Georgetown, Texas.

Charles T. Thrift, Jr.

### TEACHINGS OF THE PROPHET JOSEPH SMITH.

Edited by JOSEPH FIELDING SMITH. Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1938. 408 pages. \$2.25.

This volume contains a selected list of extracts from the sermons and writings of the Mormon prophet, arranged in chronological order. The six sections into which the book is divided include teachings of the prophet given in the following indicated years: 1830-1834; 1834-1837; 1838-1839; 1839-1842; 1842-1843; and 1843-1844. The selection and arrangement have been made by the official historian of the L.D.S. church, Joseph Fielding Smith, and his assistants. The volume under review gives a larger compilation of source material dealing with Joseph Smith than that which appeared in a similar volume issued about twenty-five years ago by Elder Edwin F. Parry.

Being an official publication of the L.D.S. church, it is natural that every endeavor was made to present Joseph Smith in as favorable a light

as possible. It is evident that no effort was made to include all of Smith's teachings. Take for instance his teaching on polygamy. The elaborate index of the volume under review does not even list the word. Under the title, "Plural wives, instruction on," we are referred to page 323, on which we find the beginning of a teaching given by the prophet on October 5, 1843, in which he said: "I have constantly said no man shall have but one wife at a time, unless the Lord directs otherwise." However, when we turn to their *Doctrine and Covenants* (pp. 463 ff.), we find that on July 12, 1843, the prophet gave his "revelation" regarding the "Eternity of the Marriage Covenant, including Plurality of Wives." The fact is that Joseph Smith did not make his "revelation" regarding polygamy public to his church until August 28, 1852. The doctrine was practiced even in the face of denials, and then later publicly acknowledged.

The fact that the book under review gives only Smith's denial of the doctrine is indicative that either Mormonism is changing or that the leaders of that church today are apologetic in regard to the doctrines and teachings of the church. The reader of this book should remember that the picture here given of Joseph Smith is biased.

On the whole, however, all students of this interesting phenomenon in America's religious life will welcome the volume, for it brings under one cover many selections which are scattered through various works, some of which are hard to find. The book was probably written for the members of the L.D.S. church, but will be of interest to "Gentiles" as well.

San Anselmo, California.

Clifford M. Drury.

### ITALY AND THE VATICAN AT WAR

By S. WILLIAM HALPERIN. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.  
xvii, 483 pages. \$3.00.

This is the second volume of a projected trilogy and deals with the crisis of the 1870's in Italo-Vatican relations. From the taking of Rome to the deaths of Victor Emmanuel and Pius IX, the conflict between state and church rages incessantly, and Dr. Halperin does justice to its many phases by paying special attention to the opinions and policies of the various party organs both in Italy and abroad, so that the reader cannot fail to appreciate the complications that have notoriously haunted the Roman Question. The way in which the Law of Papal Guarantees was passed by the parties of the Right and the subsequent manoeuvres of clericals throughout Europe to bring about intervention for the restoration of the temporal power of the popes is an amazing story of diplomatic intrigues and party politics.

The reader gets the impression from this account, though the author may not share it, that the Roman Question was virtually solved in 1871, and that the whole subsequent turmoil was due to the desire on the part of the extreme Left to outlaw religion, as it were, and the failure on the part of the Vatican to realize that the traditional game of foreign intervention could not be successfully continued with the new Italian state. The evi-

dence is that the Vatican expected the Italian state to be short-lived and relied especially on France to restore more than Rome to the church. Not until the defeat of Austria in the World War and the definite abandonment by France of its rôle as defender of the church, was the Vatican finally convinced that the old claims were futile. Pius IX, at least, was intransigent and refused to admit that there could be a spiritual power devoid of temporal power. As a background for the Concordat of 1929, this history is invaluable. It also throws considerable light on the *Kulturkampf*, though the author unfortunately does not pursue this aspect of the struggle.

Columbia University, New York City.

Herbert W. Schneider.

### THE MODERN MOVEMENT IN AMERICAN THEOLOGY

By FRANK HUGH FOSTER. New York: Fleming H. Revell company, 1939. 219 pages. \$1.75.

The subtitle of this volume—*Sketches in the History of American Protestant Thought from the Civil War to the World War*—reflects more truly its real character, for it is neither comprehensive nor systematic in its treatment. However, the reader will find valuable material on the contributions made to the development of liberal theology by such men as Gladden, Newman Smyth, Munger, Henry Ward Beeche, Lyman Abbott, George A. Gordon, W. N. Clarke, H. C. King, Levi L. Paine, G. B. Foster, and the author himself.

Three schemes of the organization cut across each other in the treatment and create confusion. At times the author deals with schools of thought, then again individual thinkers receive separate chapters. The result is that no unified impression is given, comparable to that of John W. Buckham's *Progressive Religious Thought in America* which covers much of the same material.

The major forces which precipitated the problems courageously faced by the modernists were Darwinism and the general theory of evolution as developed by Spencer, higher criticism of the Bible, Hegelian idealism, the new social sciences, history of religions, and psychology. The author deals principally with the first two. It is surprising, therefore, to find no reference to Henry Preserved Smith's work in Biblical criticism or to Burton and Mathews' widely read *Life of Christ*, or to the writings of A. C. McGiffert; while names like W. D. Hyde and Josiah Royce remind us of Hegel's influence.

The chapter on foreign influences on American theology is very superficial, treating only Fairbairn, Ritschl, and Frank. The impact of Spencer's synthetic philosophy, of Lotze's personalism (on B. P. Bowne), and of the symbolo-fideism of Sabatier is ignored; while nothing is said of the positive influence of Harnack and Troeltsch. J. Y. Simpson in Scotland was already dealing with the problem which occupied Newman Smyth before the latter's *The Meaning of Personal Life* appeared.

In general, the book is harsh and dogmatic in its handling of the earlier leaders who would not go as far as the author in rejecting miracles and

speculative theology; and the fact that the volume was written in 1934 is at times hard to believe, so firmly attached is the writer to the "radicalism" of the early twenties of our century. Curiously enough, nothing is said of the distinguished movement in psychology of religion in which America, under the leadership of William James, Starbuck, Coe, Ames, Irving King, and Pratt, made such striking advances in the examination of religious experience. Incidentally, his statement (p. 196) that G. B. Foster did not publish a constructive volume is inaccurate; for in 1909 there had appeared *The Function of Religion in Man's Struggle for Existence*.

The University of Chicago.

Edwin E. Aubrey.

### SOME ASPECTS OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

Compiled by HELEN C. M. DAVIS. New York: Harper & Bros., 1938. xviii, 182 pages. \$3.00.

This is a collection of documents bearing upon the subject of religious liberty and based chiefly upon official legal enactments. The countries studied are chiefly those of the Near East, such as Syria, Palestine, Iraq, Egypt, the Sudan, and Turkey. Some fifty pages of the work are taken up by very useful and illuminating comments, while the rest of the work is devoted to the documents and excerpts dealing with International Agreements, Constitutional Guarantees, Regulations with Respect to Change of Religion, and similar topics. Although a work of this sort is soon likely to become antiquated, particularly since the original material was prepared in 1933-34, yet it is undoubtedly of great value, for it presents in a convenient form much source material hitherto unpublished except in the country and language to which it applies, or otherwise difficult to secure. It is not a complete collection of pertinent material, but even in its present form it is of undoubted usefulness.

The Chicago Theological Seminary.

Matthew Spinka.